DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 877 JC 940 580

TITLE	Report of the Certification Study Committee.
INSTITUTION	Arizona State Board of Directors for Community Colleges, Phoenix.
PUB DATE	Oct 94
NOTE	99p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; *Board of Education Policy; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Economic Impact; Educational Practices; National Norms; National Surveys; *Program Termination; State Programs; State Surveys; Statewide Planning; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Certification; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Arizona

ABSTRACT

Prepared in response to a legislative recommendation that the certification of community college faculty by the State Board of Community Colleges be discontinued, this report provides results from constituent surveys, recommendations, and background materials. First, background information is provided on the review, indicating that there are presently six types of teacher certificates authorized by the Board and that the study team determined that there were three alternatives for assuring teaching faculty qualifications: retain teacher certification with or without legislative modifications, replace certification with statewide minimum standards administered by the districts, or replace the certification process with local standards developed and administered at the district level. Reports are then provided on surveys of 38 state community college directors, administrators and faculty at all Arizona community colleges, and 110 recently certified teachers, indicating that state-level certification of community college teachers is not common nationwide, responses from Arizona practitioners were mixed regarding program continuation or discontinuation, and that recently certified teachers generally favored the continuance of statewide certification of faculty. Finally, fiscal effects are listed for the three scenarios considered by the study team. Appendixes provide survey instruments and detailed responses from the surveys of nationwide certification practices, Arizona community college personnel, and certified individuals and state rules for community college certification. (KP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 374 877

The State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona

Report of the the Certification Study Committee

October 1994

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Puyear

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

JC 940 580

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR
COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF ARIZONA

3225 N. CENTRAL AVENUE , SUITE 1220 PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85012-2411
TEL (602) 255-4037 FAX (602) 279-3464

DONALD E. PUYEAR, PH.D.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

October 6, 1994

Mr. Dalton H. Cole, Jr., Chairman
State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona
3225 North Central Avenue, Suite 1220
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2411

Dear Mr. Cole:

On behalf of the Certification Study Committee I am pleased to present the enclosed report of its study of community college teacher certification in Arizona. This study was conducted by the committee for the State Board in response to the requirements of House Bill 2001, Eighth Special Session, of the 1994 Legislature.

The report is the result of extensive study and debate among the members of the Study Committee and represents the general consensus of the committee, which was not always unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald E. Puyear

Report of the Certification Study Committee

Background

Arizona Revised Statutes charge the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona with the responsibility of certifying community college teaching faculty. The statutes state, in pertinent part:

> ***§ 15–1425. General administrative powers of the state board***
> *The state board shall:*
> ...
> *3. Permit and arrange for certification of experienced and qualified community leaders in business, the professions and the arts for the purpose of teaching classes at a community college in fields of their specific competence.*
> *4. Establish qualifications of the instructional staff and establish standards of vocational and technological competence required to instruct in occupational as well as academic subjects.*
> ...
> *7. Fix and collect fees for issuance and renewal of certificates as provided in paragraph 3 of this section. The state board shall transmit all fees to the state treasurer for deposit in a special fund, designated the "certification fund", which the state board shall use for the purpose of defraying the costs of certification.*

The 1994 Legislature, responding to a Joint Legislative Budget Committee staff recommendation that statewide community college faculty certification be discontinued, required the State Board to conduct a study of the certification function. Specifically, H. B. 2001, Eighth Special Session, (Appropriations Act) specified:

> *The state board of directors for community colleges shall conduct, in cooperation with the ten community college districts, the joint legislative budget committee staff and the office of strategic planning and budgeting, a comprehensive review of community college teacher certification in Arizona, including a comparative analysis of other state's statutes, policies and procedures regarding the establishment, implementation and enforcement of qualifications and standards of instructional staff. The board shall also develop a prioritized set of alternative scenarios for retaining, eliminating or modifying community college teacher certification, including a line item fiscal impact statement of each alternative scenario to the state, board and districts, respectively. The board shall present its findings in a report to the joint legislative budget committee by October 31, 1994.*

The State Board, accordingly, named a Certification Study Committee consisting of the following individuals:

From the State Board:

Mr. Dalton Cole, Chairman
Dr. Donald E. Puyear, Executive Director
Mr. Gordon Hall, Associate Executive Director for Educational Services
Mr. Pete Gonzalez, Director of Community and Governmental Relations

From Community College Districts

Dr. Charles Hall, President, Mohave Community College
Ms. Lupe Gutierrez, Supervisor of Employment, Maricopa Community College District

From the Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting

Dr. Douglas R. Tucker, Budget Manager
Ms. Jennifer Mabry, Budget Analyst

From the Joint Legislative Budget Committee

Dr. Bruce Groll, Research/Fiscal Analyst

This is the report of that study committee.

Community College Teacher Certificates

There are presently six types of teacher certificates authorized by the State Board. These are regular (lifetime), provisional, special, district-specific, honorary, and internship certificates. Approximately 4,000 certificates are issued annually. The rules governing the certification process are included as Appendix D of this report.

- **Regular (lifetime) certificates** are for those who have met all requirements and have completed a three-semester hour community college course. The fee for a Regular certificate is $100.00. Approximately 30% of certificates issued are Regular certificates.
- **Provisional certificates** are for those who have met all requirements, but have not yet completed the community college course. Provisional certificates expire in two years, during which time the community college course must have been taken. The fee for a Provisional certificate is $40.00. Approximately 25% of certificates issued are Provisional certificates.
- **Special certificates** are usually issued in an occupational field and are for part-time instructors. They require a Bachelor's degree and three years of directly related work experience or an applicable Arizona license. Special certificates are initially issued for a two-year period and can then be renewed for a six-year period after completion of the community college course. The fee for a Special certificate is $50.00. Approximately 45% of certificates issued are Special certificates.

The following three categories of certificates are less frequently used:

- **District-specific certificates** are for persons uniquely qualified but who do not meet the normal requirements for a certificate. The chief executive officer of the community college (president/chancellor) authorizes the certificate. District specific certificates are initially issued for a two-year period. They can then be renewed for a six-year period after

completion of the community college course. The fee for a District-specific certificate is $50.00. Approximately 2% of certificates issued are District-specific certificates.

- **Honorary certificates** may be requested by a chief executive officer of a college for a renowned person who does not meet the specific requirements for certification. This certificate is subject to annual review and approval. The fee for an Honorary certificate is $20.00. Approximately six are issued annually.
- **Internship certificates** are provided for a person recommended for, and admitted to, an approved intern program. It is issued for a single semester, or six months, and is not renewable. The fee for an Internship certificate is $10.00. One or two are issued annually.

In 1994-95, for the first time, the Certification Fund became an appropriated fund. Proceeds from certification fees are deposited to the fund, but only the amount appropriated is available for use. For FY95, this appropriation is $135,100[1]. It includes $82,240 in personal services, $42,860 in other expenses, and $10,000 indirect cost recovery for the operation of the State Office. Certification fund revenue was $230,880 in 1993-94. As of June 30, 1994, there was an unexpended balance of $98,813 in the fund.

Study Methodology

The Certification Study Committee considered that there were three basic alternatives for assuring teaching faculty qualifications in Arizona's community colleges. These alternatives are: (1) retain teacher certification with or without legislative modifications, (2) replace certification with statewide minimum standards administered by the districts with periodic audits of compliance, and (3) replace the certification process with local standards developed and administered at the district level.

In order to provide a perspective from different constituencies, the Certification Study Committee decided to conduct three surveys:

(1) State community college directors in each of the other 49 states were surveyed to determine how teaching faculty standards were administered in other states.
(2) The president, a human resource professional, a representative of the full-time teaching faculty, and a representative of the part-time teaching faculty of each Arizona community college were surveyed to determine their views.
(3) A stratified random sample of 200 persons certified in 1993 was surveyed.

The results of each survey are briefly summarized below.

State Directors Survey. The state community college directors in each of the other 49 states were surveyed to determine how teaching faculty standards were administered in other states. Thirty-eight state directors (77.6%) responded to the survey, including one state (North Dakota) with no

---

[1]This is the number shown in the Appropriation Act. The 5% salary increase given State employees (3% in July + 2% in April) was subsequently added.

community colleges. The report of the results of this survey, *Methods of Certifying Community College Faculty Qualifications in the United States*, is included as Appendix A to this report. The report included the following responses to the key questions:

Do you have any type of formal certification of community college faculty?

Response	Number	Percent
State Certification	4	10.8%
Local Certification	3	8.1%
No Certification	29	78.4%
Other	1	2.7%
Total	37	100.0%

Do you have standards for community college faculty qualifications?

Response	Number	Percent
State Standards	13	35.1%
Local Standards	3	8.1%
Local Option	1	2.7%
Local & State Standards	2	5.4%
No Standards	17	45.9%
Other	1	2.7%
Total	37	100.0%

Of the 37 states responding, over 78% have no formal certification of community college faculty, nearly 46% have no standards for community college faculty qualifications, and 62% have vested the decision of setting standards for community college faculty qualifications in local community college jurisdictions.

District Personnel Survey. A questionnaire was sent to each Arizona Community College President/Chancellor on May 12, 1994. Along with the President's questionnaire were copies to be distributed to a human resource professional, a representative of the full-time faculty, and a representative of the part-time faculty. The cover memorandum requested that the questionnaires be returned to the State Office by May 27, 1994.

As of June 22, 1994, fifteen questionnaires from Presidents/Chancellors had been returned. All ten community college districts are represented. Twelve human resource professionals responded: eight from rural and four from urban districts. Nine full-time faculty responses were received: two from urban districts, six from rural districts, and one with no identification. Eight part-time faculty questionnaires were returned: three from urban and five from rural colleges.

The report of the results of this survey, *Results of the Community College Personnel Questionnaire on Community College Certification in Arizona,* is included as Appendix B to this report. The conclusions reported are:

> *Based on the results of this survey, the only clear conclusion that can be reached is that there is a broad range of opinion, firmly held and articulately stated, but no consensus regarding continuation of the statewide centralized certification by the State Board. District-level human resource directors from the two urban districts are particularly articulate in supporting the continuation of certification. College-level personnel from both urban and rural districts are about evenly divided on the question.*
>
> *There is also no clear mandate regarding the "community college course" or the provision of additional flexibility in the process.*
>
> *There is a general consensus that the fees should be lowered.*

Survey of Recently Certified Persons. A stratified random sample of persons receiving a community college teaching certificate in 1993 was surveyed to obtain responses to three questions relating to community college teacher certification in Arizona. The three questions were (1) Should a centralized statewide community college teacher certification process be retained, replaced, or modified? (2) To what extent was the "community college course" helpful/useful to you? (3) Are the fees for certification reasonable, if not, how should they be changed?

Two hundred questionnaires were mailed on June 6, 1994. One hundred and ten responses had been returned by July 18. The response rate of 55% is considered to be excellent for a survey of this type.

The report of the results of this survey, *Results of the Survey of Recently Certified Persons,* is included as Appendix C to this report. The conclusions reported are:

> *The respondents to this survey expressed a strong endorsement for centralized statewide community college teacher certification in that only 19.1% of the respondents said that the centralized statewide community college teacher certification process should be discontinued. Another 64.5% of them said that it should be retained as it is and 16.4% recommended retention with modifications.*
>
> *Forty-four percent of the respondents found the community college course to be very helpful/useful, and another 21.1% found it somewhat helpful/useful. Just over a third of the respondents (33.7%) reported that the course was not helpful/useful. A number of suggestions were made for ways in which the course*

should be improved. More direct supervision and quality assurance of the community college course by the State Board is indicated.

Just under half (48.6%) of the respondents said the present fees were reasonable. There was considerable support (29.0%) for the concept of lower fees for in-state applicants with the present higher fees continuing to be charged out-of-state applicants. About 22% of the respondents indicated the fees should be lowered for all.

The committee cautions that, since the respondents had all recently invested in the certification process, there may be some bias in the results of this survey.

Discussion

A number of arguments are advanced for and against the retention of statewide community college teacher certification. These include the following:

Arguments for discontinuing statewide certification of community college instructors.

- Certification of community college instructors is done in only a few other states.
- Community colleges should be consistent with Arizona's universities, which do not have faculty certification.
- Each college should be able to establish and implement its own standards.
- Each college should be able to rely upon its own professionals to implement State standards for employment of faculty.
- The peer review process typically used for employing (full-time) faculty makes certification unnecessary.
- Certification may limit access to employment as a community college faculty member.
- The regional accreditation standards make certification unnecessary.

Arguments for retaining certification.

- Statewide certification assures that candidates for teaching positions have achieved minimum standards of education and/or occupational experience.
- Statewide certification assures that faculty at various community colleges all meet the same minimum standards. This is particularly important for transfer articulation agreements which often include assurances that transfer courses are taught by certified faculty.
- Candidates for part-time teaching positions typically do not get the thorough peer review accorded full-time faculty candidates, and community colleges are increasingly relying on part-time faculty.
- The certification process is established and is self-supporting.
- Statewide certification by the State Board is consistent with Arizona's system of shared governance by the State Board and the local governing boards.

- Certification enables the colleges to demonstrate compliance with regional accreditation standards for faculty qualifications.

The committee understands that some of the above arguments are mutually exclusive. They, nonetheless, have all been advanced at one time or another in the consideration of this issue of community college faculty certification. The committee looked to the surveys for guidance. However, the surveys do not provide a mandate, one way or another.

- The survey of community college State Directors demonstrated that community college faculty certification is not common. Standards for community college faculty exist in a majority of states, but administration of these standards varies widely.

- The survey of community college personnel in Arizona was virtually a dead heat, except that the human resource directors in the two large urban districts strongly supported retention of certification.

- The survey of recently certified individuals showed strong support for centralized statewide community college faculty certification.

The surveys of Arizona community college district personnel and recently certified persons did, however, suggest that if certification is retained certain changes or enhancements should be considered:

- The fees should be reviewed to assure that they are not higher than necessary to produce revenues sufficient to cover costs. The presence of a substantial carry-forward in the certification fund suggests that the fees can be reduced substantially.

- The community college course requirement should either be made more consistently strong, or the course should be eliminated. There is not just one course. Several different colleges and universities offer the course and there is no process in place to assure consistency or quality of these offerings. From the remarks made by the survey respondents it appears that some courses are excellent while others are a waste of time.

Recommendations

The Certification Study Committee recommends the State Board submit the following alternative scenarios to the Legislature. The scenarios are in priority order.

Scenario I — No Legislative Change to Certification Process

Maintain centralized statewide community college teacher certification.

The Certification Study Committee recommends that the State Board, through its rule making authority, consider each of the following changes to the present certification process. No legislative action is required to accomplish these changes.

- The State Board should consider whether the regular certificate should be changed from a lifetime certificate to a six- or eight-year certificate with a requirement for appropriate continuing education for renewal.
- The "community college course" should be retained, but the State Board, in collaboration with the districts, should develop more precise guidelines for the course. Further, the State Board should systematically seek evaluative input from completers of the various courses and report the results to the course providers.
- The State Board should examine the use of district specific and honorary certificates. If they are retained, their use should be carefully monitored to assure that it does not become excessive. The indiscriminate use of these alternative certification procedures will undermine the integrity of the certification process.
- Fees should be reduced significantly, but they should be set at a level sufficient to cover all state-level direct and indirect costs of the certification process.

Fiscal Impact: Inasmuch as the scenario represents maintenance of the *status quo*, and certification is currently funded by fees, there is no financial impact on the State Board, the districts, or the state.

Scenario II — Replace the Certification Process with Statewide Minimum Standards Administered by the Districts with Periodic Audits of Compliance

Statewide standards, based initially on the current standards for certification which have been developed with the participation of college personnel, will be adopted by the State Board to be administered by the community college districts. Compliance with these standards will be assured by periodic audits of compliance.

The certification section of the State Office will be eliminated. District and/or college personnel verify credentials on all persons receiving full-time or part-time teaching faculty appointments and assure that the standards were met.

Fiscal Impact: The following fiscal impact on the State Board, the Districts, and the State has been identified.

State Board:

- Expenses for certain items now paid as direct costs of certification will continue for some time. Insurance ($3,960) and repair/ maintenance of the office photocopier ($1,500) expenses will continue indefinitely. Office lease expenses ($17,500) will continue until a revised lease can be negotiated economically. — $ 22,960

- The expense of items paid for by the indirect cost recovery from the certification fund will be shifted to the general fund. — $ 10,000

- Three FTE positions now performing teacher certification duties will be abolished. This will not, however, produce any savings to the general fund since these positions are now funded by certification fees. — $ 0

Districts:

- The impact of this scenario on rural districts is not expected to be significant, since most of them already provide substantial assistance to individuals seeking certification. Implementation of this scenario would not, therefore, impose a great additional burden on these colleges. — Rural $0

- Urban districts, however, will have to have additional personnel to verify the credentials of full-time and part-time faculty. The Maricopa County Community College District estimates that its first-year expenses will be $228,956. After the first year, the annual expenses are estimated to be $199,562, inclusive of salaries, equipment repair, printing costs, supplies, postage, — Maricopa Personnel $179,562; Other Expenses $49,394

temporary wages, and overtime wages. A separate fiscal impact estimate was not requested from Pima Community College.

State:

- The verification audit will require either additional personnel in the State Office or additional personnel in the office of the Auditor General, depending on how the compliance audit is handled. If handled by the State Board, one additional FTE would be required as well as extensive travel expenses.

Personnel	Other Expenses
$ 38,000	$ 15,000

This scenario represents the most common alternative to certification. It works well in other states. It shifts the cost of verifying faculty credentials from user fees to the general fund of the state and the respective community college districts.

Scenario III — Replace the Certification Process with Local Standards Developed and Administered at the District Level

Remove all statewide standards. Rely upon the districts to adopt and administer appropriate standards for teaching faculty.

Fiscal Impact:

State Board:

- Same as for Scenario II. $ 32,960

Districts:

- Same as for Scenario II. $228,956

State:

- No fiscal impact on the state is identified.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A — *Methods of Certifying Community College Faculty Qualifications in the United States*

APPENDIX B — *Results of the Community College Personnel Questionnaire on Community College Certification in Arizona*

APPENDIX C — *Results of the Survey of Recently Certified Persons*

APPENDIX D — Rules for Community College Faculty Certification in Arizona

R7-1-64. Employment standards by districts; professional staffing standards; instructors; librarians; others.
R7-1-65. Certification standards
R7-1-66. Refusal of teaching certificate; appeal; review
R7-1-67. Reprimand of teacher; suspension or revocation of teaching certificate; appeal; review
R7-1-68 Certification of interns

APPENDIX A

Methods of Certifying Community College Faculty Qualifications in the United States

Methods of Certifying Community College Faculty Qualifications in the United States

A Report Prepared for the Certification Study Committee

July 21, 1994

The Legislature of the State of Arizona passed HB2001 (general appropriations; fiscal year 1994-1995) during its eighth special session in 1994. Language in this bill called for the State Board, in cooperation with the community college districts, the Joint Legislative Budget Committee staff and the Governor's Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting staff, to conduct a comprehensive review of community college teacher certification.

This study was to examine the continued viability of the certification of Arizona community college faculty by the State Board office, done as part of its statutory responsibilities, as cited below:

> The state board shall:
>
> . . .
>
> 3. Permit and arrange for certification of experienced and qualified community leaders in business, the professions and the arts for the purpose of teaching at a community college in the fields of their specific competence.
>
> 4. Establish qualification of the instructional staff and establish standards of vocational and technological competence required to instruct in occupational as well as academic subjects.[1]

As part of this study, the committee assigned to fulfill the requirements of HB2001 developed a series of surveys, one of which was a questionnaire on how other states assure that community college faculty meet some minimum standard of education and/or experience.

The State Board office sent this questionnaire to the appropriate state agencies of the other 49 states. A sample of the survey questions and responses is found in Appendix A of this report. Thirty-eight responses were received for a response rate of 75.6%.

One important caveat: this questionnaire was only meant to survey current faculty credentialing practices in other states. It does not consider the type of community college system involved, or their comparability to the Arizona community college system. This latter statement is particularly important, and is best illustrated from the following comments of Louis W. Bender of Florida State University:

> The social institution we call the community college has evolved from grassroots demands of local publics. The sponsorship varied, from local school districts and other local taxing entities to state sponsorship and even university system sponsorship

---

[1] Arizona Revised Statutes, section 15-1425, paragraphs 3 and 4.

in a few cases. As a result, the community college is different when examined from a state system perspective, while also very similar when examined from an institutional mission or purpose perspective.

Failure to acknowledge and understand the historical and programmatic differences among state two-year college systems (even their names vary radically; i.e., community colleges, technical colleges, junior colleges, technical institutes or just plain colleges) contributes to misinterpretation and misuse of data related to programs, enrollments, graduation rates, and other quantified measures reported as national norms by the national press and media as well as professional publications.[2]

As can be understood from the above text, each state has its own history of how community colleges originated and its own interpretation of what they are meant to be:

> The reality, of course, is the unique individuality of each state's community college system. Actually, there are 49 unique systems (or non-systems, in some cases) represented throughout the nation. Upon reflection, it is not surprising that such is the case for a social institution that has as its primary purpose being community-based. Therefore, to understand any national movement is to understand each individual state system of two-year colleges. And to compare one state with another similarly requires such understanding.[3]

Because of this, it is reasonable to assume that there is not one prevailing national practice as regards any function of the community college. Rather, diversity and individuality are to be considered the norms. This is the nature of the system and should be considered when studying how each state determines professional qualifications or standards for its faculty. With this caveat in mind, the report will proceed to the analysis of responses.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

The responses in this section are broken down by the question and answer type. As is indicated in the questions included in the survey (see Appendix A), there were four questions with five possible sets of responses. Responses to Question 1 were textual in nature; no qualitative analysis was possible. The responses to questions 2a, 2b (two sets) and 3 were quantitative and have been tabulated by state in Appendix B of this report. Summaries and notes for these latter questions are included below in the text. Please note the for analysis, the total number of respondents is 37, even though the total number of responses from the states equals 38. This was done because one

---

[2]Bender, Louis W. "Introduction" in Fountain, Ben E. and Terrence A. Tollefson. *Community Colleges in the United States: Forty-Nine State Systems*. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1989. p. viii.

[3]Ibid.

state, South Dakota, responded to the questionnaire by answering: "We have no community colleges" and therefore did not provide responses to the questions.

Responses to Question 1: "What type of state-level or local policy or procedure do you have for assuring that community college faculty meet some minimum standard of education and/or experience?":

1. **ALABAMA** states, "Formal certification of technical, junior, and community college faculty is a responsibility of the respective institutions in the Alabama College System as is the compliance audit of faculty qualifications.

   Upon request, the Department of Postsecondary Education periodically provides technical assistance to colleges such as an interpretation of the standards or a review of education and experience components."
2. **ALASKA**: "The University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) has a two-track (academic and vocational) system for faculty with credentials and teaching obligations similar to community college faculty that establishes minimum qualifications for initial hire, retention, promotion and tenure. Pre-tenure evaluation is through annual reviews by peers and academic administrators based on an annual workload agreement that defines the faculty member's obligations and expectations. Review for promotion and tenure is more intense, focusing on the previous five to seven years' work. Post-tenure review is periodic (three to five years)."
3. **ARKANSAS**: "Faculty in AAS programs must have a min[imum] of an associate degree, by [19]99 a bachelor's degree. AA faculty, a min[imum] of a master's with at least 18 grad[uate] hours in teaching field."
4. **CALIFORNIA**: ". . . the State Board of Governors adopts general rules, including a list of specific requirements by discipline prepared primarily by the statewide Academic Senate, and then local community college districts evaluate the qualifications of applicants according to those rules. An important element is local 'equivalency,' by which a district can hire someone who does not meet statewide MQ's [minimum qualifications], if the local academic senate agrees the person has equivalent qualifications."
5. **COLORADO**: "Colorado has had for a number of years state level education and experience requirements for community college faculty who teach vocational courses. Each college is free to set its own qualifications for hiring and retaining non-vocational faculty." However, the report goes on to say: "About a year ago, the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education adopted a policy which permits (but does not require) community colleges to locally determine hiring and retention criteria for faculty, thereby avoiding the necessity for vocational faculty to obtain a state credential. These local standards must be applicable to all faculty, not just vocational faculty and they must include a continuing education requirement. As of this date, only one community college has had a local system of faculty hiring and retention approved by the State Board. All other community colleges continue under the prior system of state credentialing of vocational faculty and local hiring and retaining of non-vocational faculty without state oversight."
6. **CONNECTICUT**: "While responsibility and authority for search and selection has been delegated to the twelve community-technical college presidents, all tenure track faculty appointments are

subject to approval by the Executive Director. Candidate profiles are reviewed to ensure compliance with established minimum qualifications. In some instances, the minimum qualifications are waived due to unique circumstances or labor market conditions, for example, appointment of faculty in certain disciplines where the market does not produce masters' prepared candidates (e.g., Hospitality Food Service Management, Radiology Technology.)."

7. **DELAWARE** has a single, multi-campus community college serving the entire state[4]. Delaware's response indicated only a set of minimum qualifications: A Bachelor's in a relevant field, four years of relevant work experience, and ability to effectively communicate subject matter content and ability to relate to a diverse population in a multicultural environment.
8. **GEORGIA**: "Board of Regents policy mandates minimum qualifications of a masters degree."
9. **HAWAII**: "HCC System has established minimum qualifications for the various disciplines. Faculty hired to work are required to meet the stated minimum qualifications." Note: the Hawaii Community College system is part of the University of Hawaii.
10. **IDAHO**: "No state or local policy exists for academic faculty; however, the College of Southern Idaho's practice is a masters degree in the subject for academic faculty. Vocational faculty are required to be state certified."
11. **ILLINOIS**: "At the state level, the Illinois Community College Board has regulations that require faculty to have appropriate qualifications, e.g. master's degrees to teach in baccalaureate transfer courses and education/training and appropriate experience to teach in occupational courses. Responsibility for hiring qualified faculty rests with the local community college. In addition, state statute requires faculty of occupational courses funded in part by the Illinois State Board of Education to have 2,000 hours of experience in the occupational field."
12. **INDIANA**: "None."
13. **IOWA**: "[Community college] faculty are required to be licensed done by the state Board of Education Examiners; [t]here are different criteria for arts and sciences and vocational/technical faculty."
14. **KANSAS**: "State law assigns the responsibility for establishing faculty credentials to each institution's board of trustees. However, other boards of control (such as the State Board of Nursing) may require specific credentials. All 19 colleges are accredited by North Central, and NCA does have minimum credential standards."
15. **LOUISIANA**: "Louisiana does not have a community college system. The state's 2-y[ea]r colleges are under the jurisdiction of three different management boards. The Board of Regents does not have a policy concerning minimum standards for community college faculty. . . . the only standards would be those of the accrediting agency (SACS) and those of the management boards which would account for all faculty, not those of 2-y[ea]r schools only."
16. **MAINE**: "Qualifications for faculty positions may vary according to discipline—while there is a growing trend toward the master's degree as a minimum qualification, in some cases it remains based upon years in trade."
17. **MARYLAND** uses criteria set forth in the *Code of Maryland Regulations*, 13B.02.03, Minimum requirements for Associate Degree-Granting Institutions, section .11. This code sets

---

[4]Fountain. p. 37.

requirements for academic and technical/vocational faculty. Responsibility for compliance with the code is placed with each associate degree-granting institution.[5]

18. **MICHIGAN**: "None—all are locally determined."
19. **MINNESOTA** states that it is ". . . a statewide system of community colleges. The Minnesota Community College System Board establishes policy which sets minimum qualifications for 'unlimited' (permanent) faculty positions."
20. **MISSISSIPPI** indicates that it uses guidelines in the Criteria for Accreditation published by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools for determining faculty standards.
21. **MISSOURI**: "There is no state-level minimum standard of education or experience for community college faculty; generally, institutions are autonomous in this regard. The only exception is that vocational faculty teaching courses eligible for voc-ed reimbursement must meet general approval criteria established by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."
22. **MONTANA**: "With [three] community colleges, each having discreet local standards, I cannot provide a general answer."
23. **NEBRASKA**: "Each district sets its own standards for faculty."
24. **NEVADA**: "Board of Regents' policy states that a minimum of a master's degree is required for instruction in baccalaureate-level courses, or an appropriate combination of education and experience. A bachelor's degree, or appropriate experience is required for instruction in occupational level courses. This is a state-level policy."
25. **NEW JERSEY**: "[New Jersey] Community College regulations - minimum qualifications master's degree or the equivalent in the field of specialization."
26. **NEW MÉXICO**: "No state-level policy or standards. Each college establishes their own."
27. **NEW YORK**: "None."
28. **OHIO**: "No state-level policy."
29. **OKLAHOMA**: "None."
30. **OREGON**: "None."
31. **PENNSYLVANIA**: "Each community college (independent of statute or regulation) establishes own standards for employment."
32. **RHODE ISLAND**: "The initial appointment and requirements for promotion of faculty at the College are described in an agreement between the Rhode Island Board of Governor's (sic) for Higher Education and the Community College of Rhode Island Faculty Association (NEA/CCRIFA)."
33. **SOUTH DAKOTA**: "We have no community colleges."
34. **VERMONT**: "Vermont has one community college, the Community College of Vermont, which has no campus and no faculty." Vermont further states in a footnote: "We do not 'fit' the question very well."
35. **VIRGINIA**: There is a uniform set of policies that are entitled Guidelines for the Academic Preparation of Faculty (VCCS-29). The policies are approved by the State Board for Community Colleges, and they are linked to the Criteria of the Southern Association of

---

[5]See Code of Maryland Regulations, section 13B.02.03.11. p. 15.

Colleges and Schools. The implementation of the policies is reviewed by professional staff in the System office, college academic administrators, and by SACS accreditation review teams."

36. **WEST VIRGINIA**: "Must have one degree level above level they are teaching (if teaching at Associate level, they must have Bachelor's degree). However, most of our community colleges require a Master's."
37. **WISCONSIN** indicates that it has a state-level administrative rule titled "Certification of Personnel: Requirements and Procedures." This rule includes certification for both academic and vocational instructors, as well as for non-community college level instructors.
38. **WYOMING** indicates that its Commission Rules include faculty qualifications for academic and vocational instructors.

Analysis of Responses to Question 2a: Do you have any type of formal certification of community college faculty?

The questionnaire sent to each state included three possible answers to this question: State, Local, or None. For analysis, another possible response, "other," was included in order to count variations from the responses on the survey (including no response). Responses to this question were as follows:

Response:	Number	Percent
State Certification:	4	10.8%
Local Certification:	3	8.1%
No Certification:	29	78.4%
Other:	1	2.7%
Total	37	100.0%

Of the states responding that they had certification (four total), three indicated that such certification was for vocational instructors only, not for academic instructors. Note that Arizona has state-level certification for all community college faculty, and should be included in this category for any complete national analysis.

Three states responded that they have local certification. However, only one state, Alabama, provided details indicating that its local certification (credentials) is via State Board of Education policy, not local policy. So this local certification is mandated at the state level. The other two states, Montana and Nebraska gave no indication as to the source of the mandate for local certification.

Minnesota was counted in the "other" category because, although this state does not have formal certification, Minnesota's response noted:

> Searches for full time faculty positions are conducted at the campus level. Applicant screening for minimum qualifications is done there. However the faculty are state

employees and the official hiring paperwork is processed at the system (statewide) level. Qualifications of those hired are verified at the system office.

In Minnesota, the state verifies the faculty member's qualifications, but does not issue a certificate per se. This is a variation of state-level involvement in the setting of faculty qualifications, but since faculty are employed by the state, it is obvious that it is the state that has the ultimate say in the hiring process. This system is different from Arizona's, because in Arizona faculty are employees of the community college district, which is a political subdivision of the state.

There were seven out of 37 states (18.9%) that indicated that they have certification. Four of the seven are state-level; three of seven are local-level. Of the local level certification, one is state-mandated, making a total of five out 37 (13.5%) states in which certification is mandated by the state.

Responses to Question 2b "Standards": Do you have standards for community college faculty qualifications with some sort of system inspection? The following responses regard "Standards":

The questionnaire for this section had three possible responses: State, Local, and None. However, for analysis, it was necessary to also include "other," for variations in response, and also "local and state" for those systems that have both state-level and local standards for faculty qualifications. Staff also included a response for "local option" because of Colorado's unique program, which will be described below. Responses were as follows:

Response:	Number	Percent
State Standards:	13	35.1%
Local Standards:	3	8.1%
Local Option:	1	2.7%
Local & State Standards:	2	5.4%
No Standards:	17	45.9%
Other:	1	2.7%
Total	37	100.0%

Maryland had indicated a "none" response to this question, but upon analysis of the materials provided, staff changed this answer to "yes." As noted above, Maryland has "minimum qualifications," which are part of *Code of Maryland Regulations*. The requirements appear to be minimal, but nonetheless seem to constitute a statewide standard.

Nevada also indicated a "none" response to this answer, but staff changed it to "yes" after reviewing the text to its answer to Question 1 above (q.v.). As noted above, its policy in this regard is "Board of Regents' policy" and that this is "state-level policy."

As noted above in Responses to Question 1 (q.v.), the State of Colorado certifies vocational faculty, and leaves academic faculty qualifications to the discretion of the local colleges. However, the state started a new, optional policy last year ". . . which permits (but does not

require) community colleges to locally determine hiring and retention criteria for faculty, thereby avoiding the necessity for vocational faculty to obtain a state credential. These local standards must be applicable to all faculty, not just vocational faculty and they must include a continuing education requirement."

The State of Hawaii and the Commonwealth of Virginia both noted that they have both state-level and local standards. It should be noted, however, that the Hawaii community college system is part of the University of Hawaii[6], and so could be considered a state-level institution.

It is important to note that of those 29 states that indicated that they do not have any formal certification or state-level verification (Minnesota), 11 of those states (37.9% of 29) do have state-level standards (two of these, Virginia and Hawaii, having both state and local standards). Rhode Island and Delaware, both with local standards, should probably be included in this category, because they have only one community college serving their respective states, in which case, local policy has the effect of statewide policy. So, including Rhode Island and Delaware, there are thirteen states out of 29 (44.8%) that do not have formal certification, but do have some type of state-level standards for faculty qualifications.

If these thirteen states are considered jointly with those eight states that have state-mandated certification (whether done by the state or at the local level, i.e., Alabama) or state verification of qualifications (Minnesota), then 21 out of 37 states, or 56.8% responding, have some sort of state-level involvement in the setting of faculty standards for their respective community college systems.

Responses to Question 2b "Inspection or Audit": Do you have standards for community college faculty qualifications with some sort of system inspection? The following responses regard "Inspection or Audit":

The questionnaire for this section had three possible responses: State, Local, and None. However, for analysis, it was necessary to also include "other," for variations in response, and also "local and state" for those systems that have both state-level and local inspection or audit. The answers were as follows:

Response	Number	Percent
State Audit:	5	13.5%
Local Audit:	3	8.1%
No Audit:	20	54.1%
Local & State Audit:	3	8.1%
Other	6	16.2%
Total	37	100.0%

[6]Fountain. pp. 50-51.

California was included as "other" because it responded: "there is a provision in the new law for periodic review of how well districts are complying with minimum qualifications, but the Chancellor's Office has not yet convened any review teams and has no specific plans to do so."

Of the other states that responded "other," Iowa stated, "not yet implemented," and the other four did not provide any explanation to their response.

Responses to Question 3: Have you recently had certification of community college faculty and changed to another procedure?

The questionnaire for this section had two possible responses: Yes or No. However, for analysis, it was necessary to also include "other," for "no response" or other types of response. Answers are as follows:

Response	Number	Percent
Yes:	1	2.7%
No:	33	89.2%
Other	3	8.1%
Total	37	100.0%

As noted, Colorado has not changed from one procedure to another, but rather has added an option for local standards (see above), and has been included in the "other" response for that reason.

California is the only other state that recently (1990) has gone through a change from state-level certification of faculty to a system of state-level standards ("minimum qualifications") with local verification of such standards. In a very general way, California's prior practice could be considered somewhat similar to Arizona's current practice, except that one would have to ignore that California is a much larger state both in terms of area and population, that it has 71 community college districts (compared to Arizona's ten) and 106 colleges (compared to Arizona's nineteen)[7]. California also had "thirteen principal types of credentials available[8] (compared to Arizona's five). Logistically, geographically and politically, California's system is not comparable to Arizona's.

California's response goes on to say that the change to "minimum qualifications" has been ". . . generally perceived as an important reform and a success, especially by faculty, who were given substantial new responsibility and authority under the reform bill." Yet, the response notes these problems:

---

[7]Fountain. p. 14.

[8]Berman, Paul, Catherine Minicucci and Daniel Weiler. *Strengthening Standards for Community College Instruction: Credentials and Qualifications in the California Community Colleges*. Berkeley: Berman, Weiler Associates. 1987. p. 6.

> It has not been an unmixed blessing, however. Because districts are still responsible for complying with a fairly elaborate system of State regulations, there is considerable paperwork to be done locally, and no fee revenue collected any longer to offset such work. The "equivalency" provision is virtually undefined and subject to much debate and manipulation by districts and local faculty.

In California's situation, one can infer that the changes from state-level certification to minimum standards verified locally has produced more red tape with a concomitant increase in bureaucracy, rather than lessened it. It is now a cost to the taxpayer, since there are no more fee revenues, and has increased the role of faculty in what is traditionally an administrative role. It has also allowed for the manipulation of standards. This is probably exacerbated by the fact that: "there is a provision in the new law for periodic review of how well districts are complying with minimum qualifications, but the Chancellor's Office has not yet convened any review teams and has no specific plans to do so."

Alabama and Vermont did not answer this response, and were marked as "other."

CONCLUSION

As the data from the states responding were analyzed, it became clear that a little over half of the states had some sort of state-level involvement in setting standards or qualifications for the teaching faculty in their community college or equivalent two-year systems. Arizona would clearly be in line with these states, even though this state has a novel way of verifying faculty qualifications.

What is even more clear is that each state varies in how it approaches this issue: some states might, in effect, be setting state standards because they only have one community college to serve the whole state, so the line between "state" and "local" become effectively blurred. In other states, the state employs the faculty, and employment qualifications are verified at the state office, which obviates the need for state-level certification, but is still controlled at the state-level. California had a complex certification system superficially like Arizona's current system, and has replaced it with minimum qualifications to be verified locally. Some community college systems are part of the state's university system. And some states stay out of the issue at hand altogether.

The point is, to echo Louis Bender above, each state is unique in the way it approaches issues in their community colleges. Individuality is the characteristic of American community college, and this is the clearest message that can be inferred from this survey.

July 21, 1994

Analysis and report by

David C. Rubí
Director of Research, Planning and Minority Relations
State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona

Prepared from data provided by a questionnaire developed by the Certification Study Committee.

Members of the Certification Study Committee

State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona
- Mr. Dalton Cole, Jr.
- Dr. Donald E. Puyear
- Mr. Gordon Hall
- Mr. Pete González

Governor's Office of Strategic Planning & Budgeting
- Mr. Doug Tucker
- Ms. Jennifer Mabry

Joint Legislative Budget Committee
- Dr. Bruce Groll

Mohave Community College
- Dr. Charles Hall

Maricopa County Community College District
- Ms. Lupe Gutiérrez

Appendix A to the Report for the Certification Study Committee
"Methods of Certifying Community College Faculty Qualifications in the United States"
July 21, 1994

SAMPLE OF QUESTIONS ASKED ON QUESTIONNAIRE

I need your help on a study we are conducting at the request of our State Legislature. I would appreciate your providing me with the following information along with any explanatory information that may be available.

1. What type of state-level or local policy or procedure do you have for assuring that community college faculty meet some minimum standard of education and/or experience? Please describe briefly.

2. Please respond to the following questions with respect to your policy or procedures:

   a. Do you have any type of formal certification of community college faculty?

   ☐ State-level ☐ Local ☐ None

   b. Do you have standards for community college faculty qualifications with some sort of systematic inspection of college compliance?

   Standards:
   ☐ State-level ☐ Local ☐ None

   Inspection or Audit of Compliance:
   ☐ State-level ☐ Local ☐ None

3. Have you recently (within the past ten years) had teacher certification of community college faculty and changed to another procedure?

   ☐ Yes ☐ No

   If so, please explain your reasons for making the change.

Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed return envelope. If additional materials are available that describe your procedure, they would be appreciated. If at all possible, I would like to get this information back by May 31, 1994.

Appendix B to the Report for the Certification Study Committee

"Methods of Certifying Community College Faculty Qualifications in the United States" July 21, 1994

Summary of Multiple Choice Responses from 49-State Survey on Community College Faculty Certification Standards	2a. Do you have any type of formal certification of community college faculty?				2b. Do you have standards for for community college faculty qualifications with some sort of systemic inspection? STANDARDS?				2b. Do you have standards for for community college faculty qualifications with some sort of systemic inspection? INSPECTION or AUDIT?				3. Have you recently had certification of community college faculty and changed to another procedure?		
	State	Local	None	Other	State	Local	None	Other	State	Local	None	Other	Yes	No	Other
1 Alabama															
2 Alaska															
3 Arkansas															
4 California												*	*		
5 Colorado	VOC					OPT									*
6 Connecticut															
7 Delaware															
8 Georgia															
9 Hawaii															
10 Idaho	VOC								VOC						
11 Illinois															
12 Indiana															
13 Iowa															
14 Kansas															
15 Louisiana															
16 Maine															
17 Maryland					*										
18 Michigan															
19 Minnesota				*											
20 Mississippi															
21 Missouri															
22 Montana															
23 Nebraska															
24 Nevada					*										
25 New Jersey															
26 New Mexico															
27 New York															
28 Ohio															
29 Oklahoma															
30 Oregon															
31 Pennsylvania															
32 Rhode Island															
33 Vermont															
34 Virginia															
35 West Virginia:															
36 Wisconsin	VOC														
37 Wyoming															

Keys * See notes for this state in text pertaining to this question VOC = Certification for vocational faculty only OPT = Optional

Table design and data tabulation by David C. Rubi, State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

Results of the Community College Personnel Questionnaire on Community College Certification in Arizona

Results of the Community College Personnel Questionnaire

on Community College Certification in Arizona

A questionnaire was sent to each Arizona Community College President/Chancellor on May 12, 1994. Along with the President's questionnaire were copies to be distributed to a human resource professional, a representative of the full-time faculty, and a representative of the part-time faculty. The cover memorandum requested that the questionnaires be returned to the State Office by May 27, 1994. A copy of the questionnaire and the cover letter to the presidents/chancellors is enclosed as Appendix 1.

As of June 22, 1994, fifteen questionnaires from Presidents/Chancellors had been returned. All ten community college districts are represented. Twelve human resource professionals responded: eight from rural and four from urban districts. Nine full-time faculty responses were received: two from urban, six from rural districts, and one with no identification. Eight part-time faculty questionnaires were returned: three from urban and five from rural colleges.

Question-by-Question Summary of Results

1. Should the present certification process be retained, replaced, or modified?

a. RETAIN the present certification process without substantive change.

b. REPLACE the certification process with statewide minimum standards for faculty personnel established by the State Board, to be administered by the districts with periodic audits of compliance.

c. MODIFY the certification process as indicated below.

Presidents/Chancellors:

	Retain	Replace	Modify
Urban	a. - 4	b. - 3	c. - 0
Rural	a. - 2	b. - 3	c. - 3
Total	a. - 6	b. - 6	c. - 3

Comments:

a. Retain: (R) [but] modify process to better expedite, be more efficient,

b. Replace: (R) The college academic officer should determine standards with approval of ACCA.

c. Modify: (R) I like option #2 but don't like the idea of State Board doing it by itself. If #2 means a collaborative effort with the districts, then I support option #2.

(R) Eliminate State Certification and establish District standards which are approved by local boards and based on guidelines by Regional Accrediting Agencies (as done in the other 48 states.)
(R) Go to a five or seven year period that requires completion of professional development courses for renewal, and strengthen background checks.

Human Resource Professionals:

	Retain	Replace	Modify
Urban	a. - 4	b. - 0	c. - 0
Rural	a. - 3	b. - 3	c. - 2
Total	a. - 7	b. - 3	c. - 2

Comments:

a. Retain: (U) A survey of our Residential faculty indicates strong support of the current process for certification.
(U) Current processes/procedures seem to accommodate both the needs of the rural districts as well as the more specific needs of the larger urban districts. Staff in the certification office does an outstanding job.
(R) Retain, but continue to review as needed.

b. Replace: (R) Local districts should set standards not state agency. Why have state certificates? Is it only for the "fees" they bring to state office?
(R) We would assume responsibility for monitoring qualifications for faculty.
(R) Provided minimum standards are maintained to keep the level of teaching high enough to provide students with quality education.

c. Modify: (R) Eliminate State Certification and establish District standards which are approved by local boards and based on guidelines by Regional Accrediting Agency (as done in the other 48 states).
(R) Establish standards as previously mentioned but also maintain data base of background investigation.

Full-time Faculty:

	Retain	Replace	Modify
Unknown	a. - 0	b. - 1	c. - 0
Urban	a. - 1	b. - 0	c. - 1
Rural	a. - 2	b. - 2	c. - 2
Total	a. - 3	b. - 3	c. - 3

Comments:

a. Retain: (R) The process currently in place seems to adequately certify qualified people as C.C. Faculty.
(U) The certification process is a necessary one and should remain as it is.

b. Replace: (none)

c. Modify: (R) Establish certification standards for each Community College District within Arizona similar to those of the State of Florida. Each District would conform to State Board Guidelines in developing District standards. Present system is out of date with respect to the majority of other states in the U. S.
(U) Instructional councils recommend to statewide discipline committees, recommend to dist., district to state. Review each year.
(R) Take course on how to teach adults "Adult Teaching/Learning."

Part-time Faculty:

	Retain	Replace	Modify
Urban	a. - 3	b. - 0	c. - 0
Rural	a. - 2	b. - 0	c. - 2
Total	a. - 5	b. - 0	c. - 2

Comments:

a. Retain: (none)

b. Replace: (none)

c. Modify: (R) Eliminate State certification and establish District standards.
(R) Make "Teaching/Learning" course mandatory.

No Resp: Cannot answer this adequately; do not know what statewide minimum standards are.

Summary of Results – Question 1.

The presidents are about evenly divided on whether certification should be retained or replaced. Six say retain (response a) and 6 say replace the certification process (response b). Three presidents suggested modifications, 2 of which included elimination of the present certification function and 1 suggested that the length of certification be changed from "lifetime" to 5 – 7 years.

The human resource professionals, particularly those from the urban districts, are much more supportive of the present certification process than are the presidents. Seven said retain the present system, 3 said replace it, and two offered modifications. One of the suggested modifications included elimination of the certification function, the other suggested that the process be expanded and strengthened.

Full-time faculty, like the presidents, were about evenly divided, with 3 giving each answer. Three other full-time faculty respondents offered modifications, 1 of which included elimination of the certification function and 2 suggested refinements of the process.

Part-time faculty were generally supportive of the certification process. Five recommended retaining the present process, none responded with the "replace" answer (response b), but one of the two suggested modifications entailed elimination of the process.

2. **Should the "community college course" continue to be required?**

   a. **RETAIN the community college course requirement in its present form.**

   b. **MODIFY the community college course as follows:** _____

   _____

   c. **ELIMINATE the community college course requirement.**

Presidents/Chancellors:

	Retain	Modify	Eliminate
Urban	a. - 3	b. - 4	c. - 0
Rural	a. - 3	b. - 4	c. - 1
Total	a. - 6	b. - 8	c. - 1

Comments:

a. Retain: (U) With or without certification, this course is valuable.

b. Modify: (R) Focus on teaching and learning, instructional methodology and delivery and the use of technology. Overview of operations, funding philosophy important however, should be covered in a short period of time.
(R) Probably should be a 500-level course offered through the Universities but taught by community college professionals.
(R) A reduced version that everyone takes: an 8-hour class (Sat. or two evenings, etc.) that covers the community college movement but does not last 45 clock hours.
(U) Bring in some methodology of teaching at C.C. level.
(R) Continue as it is very informative for individuals wanting to teach at community college. Greater focus needs to be on teaching &learning process.

c. Eliminate: (R) Each District should establish their own requirements.

Human Resource Professionals:

	Retain	Modify	Eliminate
Urban	a. - 2	b. - 2	c. - 0
Rural	a. - 4	b. - 3	c. - 1
Total	a. - 6	b. - 5	c. - 1

Comments:

a. Retain: (R) Allow local districts to teach this course to meet their local needs, especially for faculty orientation and inservice.

(R) Assuming this refers to EDU-250 and that this refers to full-time appointments.
(U) Even though the course may be taught differently at various institutions, the philosophy of the community college, i.e., a teaching institution tied inextricably to its community is the message all need to hear and understand.

b. Modify: (U) Make it more focused on teaching the adult learner.
(R) Reduce credit/contact hour requirement so that the course can be completed in one day. Completion of this course should be viewed as an introduction to the community college concept and not confused with enhancing one's ability or qualification to teach.
(U) The course should have a common curriculum and common standards.
(R) Allow waiver of course for employees who have worked at previous community colleges.
(R) Shorten the course to one credit hour.

c. Eliminate: Each District establish their own requirements.

Full-time Faculty:

	Retain	Modify	Eliminate
Unknown	a. - 0	b. - 1	c. - 0
Urban	a. - 1	b. - 1	c. - 0
Rural	a. - 5	b. - 0	c. - 1
	a. - 6	b. - 2	c. - 1

Comments:

a. Retain: (R) There is a need to make sure prospective faculty understand the history of, and workings of, the C.C.
(U) The course is a "mixed blessing," but should probably stand as a requirement due to the uniqueness of the community college system of education.

b. Modify: (?) Make it more relevant to instruction. Have it taught by faculty.
(U) More uniform statewide objectives.

c. Eliminate: (R) Each District should be able to establish own requirements.

Part-time Faculty:

	Retain	Modify	Eliminate
Urban	a. - 1	b. - 1	c. - 1
Rural	a. - 4	b. - 0	c. - 1
Total	a. - 5	b. - 1	c. - 2

Comments:

a. Retain: (none)
b. Modify: (U) Update to meet today's challenges.
c. Eliminate: (R) Requirements should be established by each district.

Summary of Results – Question 2.

The presidents and human resource professionals are nearly evenly divided on the question of the community college course, with a small majority of each saying that the requirement for the course should be eliminated. Both full-time and part-time faculty, on the other hand, were supportive of the course.

3. **Should the fees charged for certification be changed?**

   a. **LOWER THE FEES FOR ALL CATEGORIES.**

   b. **LOWER THE FEES FOR IN-STATE CANDIDATES, but retain higher fees for out-of-state candidates.**

   c. **MAINTAIN THE FEES at their present level.**

Presidents/Chancellors:

	Lower Fees	Lower for In-state	Maintain
Urban	a. - 5	b. - 1	c. - 1
Rural	a. - 6	b. - 1	c. - 0
Total	a. - 11	b. - 2	c. - 1

Comments:

a. Lower for all:
(R) Especially lower fees for part-time teachers.
(R) Lower by at least 50%.
(R) Only if State cert. retained.
(U) Eliminate fees when certification is eliminated.
(R) Fees are too high presently.

b. Lower for In-state: (none)

c. Maintain: (none)

d. No Answer: (R) If fees are required, they should be determined by each College District and approved by the local Governing Board.

Human Resource Professionals:

	Lower Fees	Lower for In-state	Maintain
Urban	a. - 4	b. - 0	c. - 0
Rural	a. - 4	b. - 0	c. - 2
Total	a. - 8	b. - 0	c. - 2

Comments:

a. Lower for all:
(U) The Regular Certificate is too expensive! $60-$75 is more reasonable.
(U) The $100.00 fee is too high for visiting staff needed to teach only one class.
(U) The certification process should be a break-even function. Fees should be the same for both in and out-of-state candidates – there are not enough instate candidates to fill the needs of the

colleges. To discriminate against out-of-state applicants is detrimental to our own future.

b. Lower for In-state: (none)

c. Maintain: (R) We have encountered no problems with the fee scale.
(R) The fees help ensure that applicants to teach are serious enough about it to spend the money.

d. No Answer: (R) Recommendation in #1 is to replace the process. The fees would be eliminated.
(R) If fees are desired they should be determined by each College District and approved by the Local Governing Board.

Full-time Faculty:

	Lower Fees	Lower for In-state	Maintain
Unknown	a. - 2	b. - 0	c. - 0
Urban	a. - 1	b. - 0	c. - 0
Rural	a. - 3	b. - 0	c. - 2
Total	a. - 6	b. - 0	c. - 2

Comments:

a. Lower for all: (U) The current price is high, there's no guarantee of teaching position.

b. Lower for In-state: (none)

c. Maintain: (R) Maintain fees — perhaps raise them.

d. No Answer: (R) Eliminate all fees at the State Board level. Let each district establish what, if any, fees should be assessed.

Part-time Faculty:

	Lower Fees	Lower for In-state	Maintain
Urban	a. - 0	b. - 2	c. - 1
Rural	a. - 2	b. - 0	c. - 3
Total	a. - 2	b. - 2	c. - 4

Comments:

a. Lower for all: (R) Compensation for part-time faculty is low, and it is an added burden to pay for certification.

b. Lower for In-state: (none)

c. Maintain: (none)

d. No Answer: (R) Eliminate fees at the State Board level and let each District determine fees.

Summary of Results – Question 3.

There is general consensus from each group that the fees for certification should be lowered.

4. **Should provisions be made for the college president/chancellor to have the ability to designate persons to receive a local level credential for quick-start courses and/or other special needs?**

   a. **ADD ADDITIONAL FLEXIBILITY for college presidents/chancellors to make exceptions to normal certification requirements as follows:** _____

   _____

   b. **DO NOT REDUCE THE RIGOR of the certification process.**

Presidents/Chancellors:

	Add Add'l Flexibility	Do Not Add Flexibility
Urban	a. - 2	b. - 4
Rural	a. - 5	b. - 1
Total	a. - 7	b. - 5

Comments:

a. Add Flexibility:
(R) but do not reduce the rigor. Uniform standards must be in place with required oversight.
(R) but do not reduce the rigor. The rigor would not be reduced (with the suggested local course).
(R) For a limited, specified amount of time and then go through the regular certification process.
(U) Exceptions to rigid academic requirements for special cases.

b. Do Not Add Flexibility:
(U) If retained.

Human Resource Professionals:

	Add Add'l Flexibility	Do Not Add Flexibility
Urban	a. - 2	b. - 2
Rural	a. - 3	b. - 3
Total	a. - 5	b. - 5

Comments:

a. Add Flexibility:
(U) Need flexibility for special expertise in some areas, in particular for some occupational courses. Visiting staff only should this apply to.
(U) Follow guidelines established by the State Board or Local Board.

(R) Because of the time that is required for institutions to send original transcripts the President should have the ability to certify on a short term or one day session.
(R) If the individual is proven qualified, the president should be allowed to make the exception. This should still require proof of either education in the field to be taught or verification of practical skills.

b. Do Not Add Flexibility: (U) The option already exists to request a waiver for special situations.
(U) I have watched too many college presidents breathe a sigh of relief when they could rely on the rigors of the certification process rather than be placed in a compromising position when faced with requests for jobs from underqualified friends, relatives, neighbors, acquaintances, politicians, and others.
(R) My perception is that this presently exists within the existing guidelines (e.g., District Specific).
(R) We already have provisions for honorary.

Full-time Faculty:

	Add Add'l Flexibility	Do Not Add Flexibility
Unknown	a. - 1	b. - 0
Urban	a. - 0	b. - 2
Rural	a. - 3	b. - 2
Total	a. - 4	b. - 4

Comments:

a. Add Flexibility: (none)

b. Do Not Add Flexibility: (R) I feel that in-place authority will suffice. A local level credential can be issued with no problem.
(U) Process needs to be uniform for standards to be consistent.
(R) Make more rigorous.

Part-time Faculty:

	Add Add'l Flexibility	Do Not Add Flexibility
Urban	a. - 1	b. - 2
Rural	a. - 1	b. - 3
Total	a. - 2	b. - 5

Comments:

a. Add Flexibility: (R) There could be quality teachers that do not meet standard requirements, but this does not mean that standards should or would be lowered.
(U) Allow easier certification for candidates w/o M.S. degree, but who are completing Ph.D.
(R) Make more rigorous.

b. Do Not Add Flexibility: (U) It is a good system. Do not fix if it is not broken.

Summary of Results – Question 4.

There is little consensus within any of the groups as to whether additional flexibility should be incorporated into the certification process.

OTHER COMMENTS:

Presidents/Chancellors:

- (R) I am a proponent of central certification and oversight of the process. I would like to have the process modified to give each district better turnaround on certification applicants and the standards and criteria used in certification merit continual analysis.
- (R) This is a matter of academic and pedagogical standards, and of institutional integrity. It is a responsibility of the colleges.

Human Resource Professionals:

- (R) The whole certification program needs to be evaluated especially the philosophy of "why" we have and "if" we need a system at all at the state level. Certification takes a lot of time and seems to be only a way to raise revenue not a method to assure quality in our staff. Many people have been certified and were not acceptable to us and our faculty to teach in our programs. Please review the goals and objectives of the certification system.
- (U) The Certification process should be retained because it ensures that we are all following the same guidelines. It also saves our District from having to create a new department to review credentials.
- (R) If the change occurs, it should be phased in over a mutually agreeable length of time. Perhaps July 1, 1995 would be reasonable.
- (U) Community colleges are teaching institutions. Faculty interact with students on a daily basis. They do not spend a great majority of their time in research or in publication efforts. Contrary to what may be the case at the university, it is critical that community college faculty meet certain criteria and that these criteria be standard throughout the state if we want to continue to expect that community college courses will be transferred to four-year institutions at face value. Although the selection process is always a subjective one to some degree, it is relatively easy in our environment to verify certain levels of expertise as they relate to education and experience. It would not be so easy if we were attempting to evaluate people on the basis of research and publication. It is true that local community college districts could "enforce" state imposed standards, but the cost of doing business would be substantially increased and the continuity and consistency would be lost. The certification process, even with all of its flaws, stands as one of the major doorkeepers of the quality of course offerings in the community colleges in this state. Certification does add a quality perspective that might be otherwise lost.
- (R) The current guidelines are not perfect, however, we have found them to be workable and generally realistic. We have encountered quirks in areas related to Engineering/Math, certification in Education, and most recently Nursing in the case of an out-of-state licensee. Still, we have found the certification staff to be solution-oriented and helpful. Our basic posture is to recognize the guidelines as being in a naturally evolving state and to work toward common goals.
- (R) It appears this form was designed to elicit a desired response which is contrary to the recommendation to eliminate state certification made by the President's Council to State Board. How does certification address continuous improvement or instructional

effectiveness? There is no guarantee of quality coming out of certification. I have reason to believe the exorbitant certification fees charged by the State Board has had a negative impact to recruitment of highly qualified part-time instructional personnel. In this day and age when most organizations are downsizing by eliminating bureaucratic red tape, it is superfluous to continue the practice of state certification.

- (R) The standards should not be lowered, but the additional step of going through the State Board could be eliminated provided the colleges maintained a professional staff to award certification.

Full-time Faculty:

- (R) The certification process currently in place is well recognized by full-time faculty. I do feel that C.C. degree graduates should be utilized as associate (part-time) faculty in some areas if teaching — i.e., vocational, art, craft areas without special requirements — i.e. 5-years in the trade, generally areas are growing. Thanks for the opportunity for input.
- (R) The concept of a State Board is outmoded. It is an antique which is regulation and bureaucratic in nature. This responder has worked in the Florida and Texas systems which are more progressive in terms of local district control. Local control allows each district to respond to local needs more effectively and provide for college missions in a responsive way which is often inhibited by State Board regulations. Local option would be more cost efficient in terms of meeting the institutions human capital needs. The cost of phone service, postage, and other communications to the State Board with questions concerning certification would be reduced. As it is now it looks like a double entry bookkeeping system is in place.
- (U) Since school is out of session, I was not able to survey the faculty for this questionnaire. I did, however, speak with the Dean of Instruction who has surveyed the Division Chairs on this issue. I have incorporated the comments he told me that he received from them. I also spoke to the Faculty Executive Council about this issue and gotten some feedback from that group. In general, the faculty believe that the current certification should remain in place, but that the cost of certification should be reduced.
- (R) Since universities require no certification, the community colleges should follow suit.
- (R) Teachers are teaching that should not be. May know subject, but lack ability to teach.
- (R) Although I have personally experienced no problem with the certification office — indeed, have been pleased with the promptness and judiciousness of their responses — some of my colleagues have had problems because some of the reviewers adopt much too rigid a view of what constitutes acceptable coursework. For example, at some colleges, intermediate accounting is a 200 level course; at U of A it is a 300 level course. If it is 300, then it seems to meet the Arizona requirement, if 200, it does not but the course content should be pretty much the same! You can make the same observations in just about any discipline. Also, there is a problem with interdisciplinary courses that can really satisfy many requirements, but which often pose problems.

Part-time Faculty:

- (R) Local control will give each District more power to met the needs of its community. Local control will increase the speed with which the community college can respond to its students' needs.
- (U) In summary, I think that it is important to maintain high standards in the overall certification process. Asking folks to take a community college course every ten years or so might be a solid idea, too, to enable them to be familiar with the focus and trends of the community college curriculum.
- (R) Part-time teachers should be just as qualified as full-time.
- (R) Very simplified, understanding form

Conclusions.

Based on the results of this survey, the only clear conclusion that can be reached is that there is a broad range of opinion, firmly held and articulately stated, but no consensus regarding continuation of the statewide centralized certification by the State Board. District-level human resource directors from the two urban districts are particularly articulate in supporting the continuation of certification. College-level personnel from both urban and rural districts are about evenly divided on the question.

There is also no clear mandate regarding the "community college course" or the provision of additional flexibility in the process.

There is a general consensus that the fees should be lowered.

APPENDIX 1

SURVEY INSTRUMENT AND COVER LETTER

STATE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR
COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF ARIZONA

3225 N. CENTRAL AVENUE , SUITE 1220 PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85012-2411
TEL (602) 255-4037 FAX (602) 279-3464

MEMORANDUM

TO: Arizona Community College Presidents/Chancellors

FROM: Don Puyear

DATE: May 12, 1994

SUBJECT: Certification Options

As you know, the legislature mandated a study of the certification function now performed by the State Board. As a part of this study, the Certification Study Committee desires the advice of several constituents within each college as to whether certification should be retained as is, modified, or replaced by minimum statewide standards.

Enclosed are questionnaires for (1) you as CEO, (2) your Human Resource professional, (3) a spokesperson for your full-time faculty association, and (4) a spokesperson for your part-time faculty association. Please distribute these questionnaires to the appropriate person at your college and ask that they be returned to me prior to May 27.

Enclosure

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PART-TIME FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY CERTIFICATION IN ARIZONA

1. Should the present certification process be retained, replaced, or modified?

   ☐ RETAIN the present certification process without substantive change.

   ☐ REPLACE the certification process with statewide minimum standards for faculty personnel established by the State Board, to be administered by the districts with periodic audits of compliance.

   ☐ MODIFY the certification process as indicated below.

   Comments: _____

   _____

2. Should the "community college course" continue to be required?

   ☐ RETAIN the community college course requirement in its present form.

   ☐ MODIFY the community college course as follows: _____

   _____

   ☐ ELIMINATE the community college course requirement.

   Comments: _____

   _____

3. Should the fees charged for certification be changed?

   ☐ LOWER THE FEES FOR ALL CATEGORIES.

   ☐ LOWER THE FEES FOR IN-STATE CANDIDATES, but retain higher fees for out-of-state candidates.

   ☐ MAINTAIN THE FEES at their present level.

   Comments: _____

   _____

4. Should provisions be made for the college president/chancellor to have the ability to designate persons to receive a local level credential for quick-start courses and/or other special needs?

   ☐ ADD ADDITIONAL FLEXIBILITY for college presidents/chancellors to make exceptions to normal certification requirements as follows: _____

   _____

   ☐ DO NOT REDUCE THE RIGOR of the certification process.

   Comments: _____

   _____

   OTHER COMMENTS: _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

Prepared by: _____

Name and Title

_____ _____

Date District

APPENDIX C

Results of the Survey of Recently Certified Persons

Results of the Survey of Recently Certified Persons

A stratified random sample of persons receiving a community college teaching certificate in 1993 was surveyed to obtain responses to three questions relating to community college teacher certification in Arizona. The three questions were (1) Should a centralized statewide community college teacher certification process be retained, replaced, or modified? (2) To what extent was the "community college course" helpful/useful to you? (3) Are the fees for certification reasonable, if not, how should they be changed? A copy of the full text of the questions and the cover letter are included as Appendix 1.

The Sample. A total of 3,931 community college teaching certificates were issued in 1993, as shown in Table 1. Survey forms were sent to 200 persons receiving certificates (5.1%) as shown in Table 2. For the purpose of this survey "Urban" was defined as having an address in either Maricopa or Pima counties. "Rural" was defined as including all other counties in the state.

Table 1. Community College Teaching Certificates Issues in 1993

	Lifetime		Provisional		Special		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Rural	262	23	259	26	873	49	1394	35
Urban	890	77	750	74	897	51	2537	64
Total	1152		1009		1770		3931	
Percent	29		26		45		100	

Table 2. Distribution of Survey Forms

	Lifetime	Provisional	Special	Total
Rural	13	13	44	70
Urban	46	38	46	130
Total	59	51	90	200

Response Rate. The survey forms were mailed on June 6, 1994. One hundred and ten responses had been returned by July 18. The response rate of 55% is considered to be excellent for a survey of this type. The distribution of the responses is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Distribution of Responses

	Forms Sent	Responses	Response Rate (%)
Rural			
Lifetime	13	10	76.9
Provisional	13	7	53.8
Special	44	25	56.8
All Rural	70	42	60.0
Urban			
Lifetime	46	29	63.0
Provisional	38	16	42.1
Special	46	23	50.0
All Urban	130	68	52.3
Total	200	110	55.0

Results. Question 1 is **"Should a centralized statewide community college teacher certification process be retained, replaced, or modified?"** The responses to this question are displayed in Table 4.

Table 4. Responses to Question 1.

	Retain		Replace		Modify		Total	No Answer
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	n
Rural								
Lifetime	5	50	3	30.0	2	20.0	10	0
Prov.	5	71.4	1	14.3	1	14.3	7	0
Special	17	68.0	3	12.0	5	20.0	25	0
Total Rural	27	64.3	7	16.7	8	19.0	42	0
Urban								
Lifetime	20	68.9	6	20.7	3	10.3	29	0
Prov.	11	68.8	2	12.5	3	18.8	16	0
Special	13	56.5	6	26.1	4	17.4	23	0
Total Urban	43	65.2	13	19.7	10	15.1	66	0
Total	71	64.5	21	19.1	18	16.4	110	0

Fewer than 20% of the respondents said that the statewide community college teacher certification process should be replaced. Nearly 65% said that the process should be retained without change, and another 16% suggested modifications. Almost all of the suggested modifications had to do with refinements of the current system, rather than suggestions for a different type of system. The detailed answers to this question, and the others, along with the comments made by the respondents, are tabulated in Appendix 2.

Question 2 addresses the present requirement that persons receiving a lifetime certificate, or renewing a special certificate, complete a 3-semester hour course on the community college. The question is **"To what extent was the 'community college course' helpful/useful to you?"** The responses to this question are displayed in Table 5. Note that some respondents did not answer this question. These were primarily recipients of provisional and special certificates who had not yet taken the course.

Table 5. Responses to Question 2.

	Very Useful		Somewhat Useful		Not Useful		Total	No Answer
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	n
Rural								
Lifetime	4	40.0	2	20.0	4	40.0	10	0
Prov.	2	40.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	5	2
Special	14	58.3	2	8.3	8	33.3	24	1
Total Rural	20	51.3	5	12.8	14	35.9	39	3
Urban								
Lifetime	13	46.4	8	28.6	7	25.0	28	1
Prov.	4	40	2	20	4	40	10	6
Special	6	33.3	5	27.8	7	38.9	18	5
Total Urban	23	41.1	15	26.8	18	32.1	56	12
Total	42	44.2	20	21.1	32	33.7	95	15

While over 65% of the respondents to the question found the community college course to be very or somewhat helpful/useful, many of these had suggestions for improving the course. These responses suggest that, if the certification function is retained, the State Board should, in collaboration with the community college districts, consider developing additional guidelines for the course. More direct supervision of the course and some form of systematic quality assurance by the State Board is indicated.

Question 3 addresses the fees charged for certification. The question is **"Are the fees for certification reasonable; if not, how should they be changed?"** The three responses provided are (a) "Yes, the fees are reasonable. Retain for future candidates for certification." (b) "Lower the fees for in-state candidates, but retain higher fees for out-of-state candidates." (c) "Lower the fees for all candidates." The responses to this question are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Responses to Question 3.

	Fees Reasonable		Lower for In-State		Lower for All		Total	No Answer
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	n
Rural								
Lifetime	0	0.0	4	40.0	6	60.0	10	0
Prov.	6	85.7	0	0.0	1	14.3	7	0
Special	16	66.7	4	16.7	4	16.7	24	1
Total Rural	22	53.6	8	19.5	11	26.8	41	1
Urban								
Lifetime	13	46.4	14	50.0	1	3.6	28	1
Prov.	7	43.8	3	18.8	6	37.5	16	0
Special	10	45.4	7	31.8	5	22.7	22	1
Total Urban	30	45.4	24	36.4	12	18.2	66	2
Total	52	48.6	32	29.0	23	21.5	107	3

Nearly half (48.6%) of the respondents to this question said the present fees are reasonable. Twenty-nine percent said the fees should be lowered for in-state applicants, but retained at their present level for out-of-state applicants, while 21.5% said the fees should be lowered for all applicants.

Conclusions. The following conclusions may be drawn from the results of this survey:

- The respondents to this survey expressed a strong endorsement for centralized statewide community college teacher certification in that only 19.1% of the respondents said that the centralized statewide community college teacher certification process should be discontinued. Another 64.5% of them said that it should be retained as it is and 16.4% recommended retention with modifications.

- Forty-four percent of the respondents found the community college course to be very helpful/useful, and another 21.1% found it somewhat helpful/useful. Just over a third of the respondents (33.7%) reported that the course was not helpful/useful. A number of suggestions were made for ways in which the course should be improved. More direct supervision and quality assurance of the community college course by the State Board is indicated.

- Just under half (48.6%) of the respondents said the present fees were reasonable. There was considerable support (29.0%) for the concept of lower fees for in-state applicants with the present higher fees continuing to be charged out-of-state applicants. About 22% of the respondents indicated the fees should be lowered for all.

The committee cautions that, since the respondents had all recently invested in the certification process, there may be some bias in their responses.

APPENDIX 1

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

STATE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR
COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF ARIZONA

3225 N. CENTRAL AVENUE , SUITE 1220 PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85012-2411
TEL (602) 255-4037 FAX (602) 279-3464

June 6, 1994

Dear Sir or Madam:

The 1994 session of the legislature required the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona and others to make a study of statewide community college teacher certification procedure. As a part of this study the study committee desires to understand the opinion of persons who have recently received a community college teaching certificate.

You are part of a randomly selected sample of recently certified individuals. It is important that we have your opinion. Please complete the survey on the opposite side of this letter and return it to us in the enclosed postage-paid envelope as soon as possible. Please feel free to add additional comments below. All responses will remain completely anonymous.

Your cooperation will be sincerely appreciated.

CERTIFICATION STUDY COMMITTEE

SR

C-8
C-9

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RECENTLY CERTIFIED PERSONS

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY CERTIFICATION IN ARIZONA

1. Should a centralized statewide community college teacher certification process be retained, replaced, or modified?

   ☐ RETAIN centralized statewide certification without substantive change.

   ☐ REPLACE centralized statewide certification process with statewide minimum standards for faculty personnel established by the State Board, to be administered by the districts with periodic audits of compliance.

   ☐ MODIFY community college teacher certification in Arizona as indicated below.

   Comments: _____

   _____

2. To what extent was the "community college course" helpful/useful to you?

   ☐ VERY USEFUL/HELPFUL, retain the community college course requirement.

   ☐ SOMEWHAT USEFUL, modify the community college course as follows:

   _____

   ☐ NOT USEFUL/HELPFUL, eliminate the community college course requirement.

   Comments: _____

   _____

3. Are the fees for certification reasonable; if not, how should they be changed?

   ☐ YES, the fees are reasonable. Retain for future candidates for certification.

   ☐ LOWER THE FEES FOR IN-STATE CANDIDATES, but retain higher fees for out-of-state candidates.

   ☐ LOWER the fees for all candidates.

   Comments: _____

   _____

APPENDIX 2

INDIVIDUAL SURVEY RESPONSES

DATA --- Survey of Certification Clients.

Code: First Character -- P = Provisional; L = Lifetime; S = Special
Second Character -- U = Urban; R = Rural

COUNT	CODE	Q1: Keep Certification? (a = Retain; b = Replace; c = Modify) Response	Q1 Comments	Q2: Usefulness of CC Course (a = Very Useful; b = Somewhat Useful; c = Not Useful) Response	Q2 Comments	Q3: Fees Reasonable? (a = Yes; b = Lower for in-state only; c = Lower for all) Response	Q3 Comments	GENERAL COMMENTS
1	PU	a		?	Just enrolled, no opinion yet.	a		
2	PU	a		b		c		
3	PU	c	Process has changed so many times over two years I feel that my efforts were a waste of time. This is a job search driven process which is not efficient or effective.	c	Course is not relevant. Candidates qualifications and course syllabus & hiring college should decide on candidates ability to teach subject matter.	a	Fee is not unreasonable if the certification program was improved by establishing a consistent and effective job search process.	
4	LU	b	Should need to do at least 10 hrs of continuing education to retain certification.	b	Need assignments that use more critical thinking and less of going to "look at campus," etc.	b		
5	LU	a		a		b		
6	LU	a		b	Provide more sessions and a qualified group of instructors.	a		Much better information should be provided on how and where to apply for teaching positions at the community colleges. Part of the testing for certification should not be a geography test on where to apply for the jobs.
7	LU	a		a		a		
8	LU	a		a		a		
9	LU	a		a		b	Oh, $50 seems more reasonable for in-state candidates.	
10	LU	a		a		a		
11	LU	a		a		a		

DATA --- Survey of Certification Clients.

Code: First Character -- P = Provisional; L = Lifetime; S = Special
Second Character -- U = Urban; R = Rural

COUNT	CODE	Q1: Keep Certification? a = Retain b = Replace c = Modify		Q2: Usefulness of CC Course a = Very Useful b = Somewhat Useful c = Not Useful		Q3: Fees Reasonable? a = Yes b = Lower for in-state only c = Lower for all		GENERAL COMMENTS
		Response	Comments	Response	Comments	Response	Comments	
12	SR	a		c	I haven't found any occasion where the information from this course has been helpful.	?	I don't know what this fee is used for, so I don't know if it is reasonable or not.	
13	SR	a		a		a		
14	SR	a		a		a		
15	SR	c	Maybe nationwide if possible.	?	Did not take.	c	$25	
16	SR	b		c		b		
17	PR	a		a		c		
18	LR	a		a		b	Permanent residents should pay a lesser fee.	
19	SU	b		?	I haven't taken it.	b		
20	SR	a		a		c		
21	SR	a		a		a		
22	SU	a		b	It helped me get acquainted with the parts of the system I was not acquainted with.	b	It seems that rates come with every step of certification.	
23	SU	b		b	I don't know what would be best. More emphasis on Associate Faculty support -- where, how, options, etc.?	a		
24	SU	a		a		c		
25	LU	a		a		a		

DATA --- Survey of Certification Clients.

Code: First Character -- P = Provisional; L = Lifetime; S = Special
Second Character -- U = Urban; R = Rural

COUNT	CODE	Q1: Keep Certification? (a = Retain; b = Replace; c = Modify) Response	Q1 Comments	Q2: Usefulness of CC Course (a = Very Useful; b = Somewhat Useful; c = Not Useful) Response	Q2 Comments	Q3: Fees Reasonable? (a = Yes; b = Lower for in-state only; c = Lower for all) Response	Q3 Comments	GENERAL COMMENTS
26	LU	b	It is important to document that teachers meet a minimum standard.	c	I thought the course was of absolutely no help to prepare me for teaching my first course. It was a complete waste of time, effort, and money. I would welcome a course to teach me how to become a better teacher.	b	The fees are too high between the required course and the certification fees.	The certification process only shows that a person has the correct number of hours in their field of interest and can pass a "Mickey Mouse" community college course. It does NOT show that the person knows anything about teaching (more)
27	LU	a		b	All enrolled should be required to demonstrate a teaching proficiency.	a		
28	PU	a		a		c	$100.00 is much too high. It has no relation to the cost of the process. It is an income producing feature.	
29	PU	a		a	I found the course interesting and informative.	a		
30	PU	c	Wider application, i.e. correctional inst., etc.	?	Have not taken course (yet).	a		
31	PU	a		b		a		
32	PU	a		?	I have not taken the course yet.	a		
33	SR	b		b	I am a part-time aerobics instructor and many of the subjects covered did not pertain to my teaching. The history of the development of community colleges was interesting but not useful in teaching.	b	In-state candidates are providing useful service to their community and I think there should be a small price break for their commitment to the community and the fact that they are an in-state resident.	
34	SR	a		a		a		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DATA --- Survey of Certification Clients.

Code: First Character -- P = Provisional; L = Lifetime; S = Special
Second Character -- U = Urban; R = Rural

COUNT	CODE	Q1: Keep Certification? a = Retain b = Replace c = Modify		Q2: Usefulness of CC Course a = Very Useful b = Somewhat Useful c = Not Useful		Q3: Fees Reasonable? a = Yes b = Lower for in-state only c = Lower for all		GENERAL COMMENTS
		Response	Comments	Response	Comments	Response	Comments	
35	SR	a		a		a		
36	LU	a		?	Course waived because of prior community college experience out of state.	a		
37	LU	b		c		b		
38	LU	a		b	The CCC contained a good review of teaching methodologies and educational philosophies.	b	$100 for a certificate seems a bit steep since in my case as a HS teacher teaching a dual credit class, I had to get my certification to remain eligible to teach these upper level classes.	I also have concerns regarding student teachers... Many of our best teachers teaching dual credit classes seem to be out of the student teaching market because subs for their classes must have MCCCD certification. However, many of these dual (more)
39	LU	a		c		b		
40	LU	a		c		a	Why would you charge more for out-of-state candidates? Unless cost of processing apps were more, it would be discriminatory.	
41	LU	b	It's ridiculous that the State Board will certify a person and a district won't hire him/her full-time because he/she does not met minimum requirements.	b	Offer two different courses - one for people with education background and those without.	b		

DATA --- Survey of Certification Clients.

Code: First Character -- P = Provisional; L = Lifetime; S = Special
Second Character -- U = Urban; R = Rural

COUNT	CODE	Q1: Keep Certification? (a = Retain; b = Replace; c = Modify) Response	Q1 Comments	Q2: Usefulness of CC Course (a = Very Useful; b = Somewhat Useful; c = Not Useful) Response	Q2 Comments	Q3: Fees Reasonable? (a = Yes; b = Lower for in-state only; c = Lower for all) Response	Q3 Comments	GENERAL COMMENTS
42	LU	c	Modify the content of course; as currently offered is inane, superficial, a farce. The content should reflect practices, application, and adult teaching practices. Literature, research is not current regarding student populations.	c	Not useful as currently presented; the course is necessary, but not in this format.	b		In my opinion, the certification question is minute compared to hiring practices. I believe money on surveys should be allocated to informing committee on EOC, ADA, and illegal discriminatory practices. The system is a gigantic lawsuit waiting to happen
43	SU	c	Update with more contemporary issues. Not go into the History so much in EDU-250.	c	More interested in the methods of teaching at the community college level than history of its development.	c	Too expensive!	
44	SU	a		a		c	Lower the fees for a regular certificate	
45	SU	b		c	It is helpful to understand the diff. nature of the Comm. College Student, however much of what was covered had already known having taught at a college level for years.	b		
46	SU	a	I feel by having the state certification makes teaching at a community college more important and prestigious.	a		a		
47	PU	b		c		b		
48	SR	a		a		a		
49	PR	a		c		a		

DATA --- Survey of Certification Clients.

Code: First Character -- P = Provisional; L = Lifetime; S = Special
Second Character -- U = Urban; R = Rural

COUNT	CODE	Q1: Keep Certification? a = Retain b = Replace c = Modify		Q2: Usefulness of CC Course a = Very Useful b = Somewhat Useful c = Not Useful		Q3: Fees Reasonable? a = Yes b = Lower for in-state only c = Lower for all		GENERAL COMMENTS
		Response	Comments	Response	Comments	Response	Comments	
50	PU	a		?	I have not taken the course.	c		
51	PU	b		a		a		
52	LU	c	Retain certification but we should be able to transfer to/from other states.	b	Include instructional design & teaching methods.	b		
53	LU	a		a		b	$50 for in-state; $200 for out-of-state. Why? Because they haven't paid any taxes here.	
54	SR	a		a		a		
55	SR	c	For professional candidates, there needs to be an assessment and a credit towards a "Master's Status" concerning the candidate's professional experience in lieu of the degree.	a		a	The fees reflect the responsible and professional caliber of the position that community college instructors convey.	
56	SR	c	I believe whichever option is the best qualitative and cost effective should be implemented--If it is the status quo then let it remain, if not change it.	a		a		
57	SU	a		a		a		
58	LR	a		a	It was a useful tool to understand the CC mission & philosophy and foresee possible changes.	c	I thought certification was high.	

72

73

DATA --- Survey of Certification Clients.

Code: First Character -- P = Provisional; L = Lifetime; S = Special
Second Character -- U = Urban; R = Rural

COUNT	CODE	Q1: Keep Certification? a = Retain b = Replace c = Modify		Q2: Usefulness of CC Course a = Very Useful b = Somewhat Useful c = Not Useful		Q3: Fees Reasonable? a = Yes b = Lower for in-state only c = Lower for all		GENERAL COMMENTS
		Response	Comments	Response	Comments	Response	Comments	
59	SU	a		b	Too brief, too general, lacks following; no real participation by attenders, no two-way discussions, no verification that attenders have learned anything.	a		
60	SU	a		b	A necessary but boring, non-creative presentation.	a		
61	SU	c	Instructors with PhD in area of instruction should be automatically certified for life.	c		c	I fail to see why these are necessary when university communities do not require them.	
62	SU	a		?	I did not have to take this course.	a		
63	PU	a		c		c		
64	LU	a		b	Assistance with how to get full-time position.	c	Fees should not be charged to adjunct" instructors who have to work full time equivalence to prepare for teaching only one or two courses that are available. In essence, we only make $5.00/hr or less. Why should we be charged a fee for being exploited??	
65	SR	a		c		a		
66	SR	a		a		a		
67	SR	b		c		b		

74

75

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DATA --- Survey of Certification Clients.

Code: First Character -- P = Provisional; L = Lifetime; S = Special
Second Character -- U = Urban; R = Rural

COUNT	CODE	Q1: Keep Certification? (a = Retain; b = Replace; c = Modify) Response	Q1 Comments	Q2: Usefulness of CC Course (a = Very Useful; b = Somewhat Useful; c = Not Useful) Response	Q2 Comments	Q3: Fees Reasonable? (a = Yes; b = Lower for in-state only; c = Lower for all) Response	Q3 Comments	GENERAL COMMENTS
68	PR	c	As a state certified teacher (7-12 Social Studies) I feel that that certification and my masters should be more than adequate for community college certification.	c		a		
69	LU	b	Eliminate -- Restricts competition	c	Doesn't insure teacher quality.	?	Eliminate	
70	SU	a		a		b		
71	SR	c	Grant 1-year provisional credential, based on current methods. Extend it based on student evaluations.	c		a		
72	SR	c	If a person is qualified to teach more than one foreign language, that person should need only one certificate, and thus pay only one fee.	a		c	It is unfair for a person to pay $50.00 for one language and another $50 for a second language certificate.	
73	SR	a		c		b		
74	PR	a		a		a		
75	SU	a		c		a		
76	PU	a		?	Didn't take it.	c		
77	LR	b		c		c		
78	LU	a		a		b		
79	SR	a		b		a		

DATA --- Survey of Certification Clients.

Code: First Character -- P = Provisional; L = Lifetime; S = Special
Second Character -- U = Urban; R = Rural

COUNT	CODE	Q1: Keep Certification? (a = Retain; b = Replace; c = Modify) Response	Q1 Comments	Q2: Usefulness of CC Course (a = Very Useful; b = Somewhat Useful; c = Not Useful) Response	Q2 Comments	Q3: Fees Reasonable? (a = Yes; b = Lower for in-state only; c = Lower for all) Response	Q3 Comments	GENERAL COMMENTS
80	LR	b	Most states don't bother with this amount of bureaucracy for community colleges.	c	The information given could have been synthesized and put in a handout and saved me a lot of wasted time and money.	c	A certificate isn't necessary at all. Most college-level teachers have at least a master's degree and know their subjects before they begin teaching.	
81	LU	a		a		b		
82	SU	b	Require all CC's to have a 3-year probationary period as required in the K-12 system.	?	Have not taken it yet. Comments from colleague tend toward "total waste of time."	?	Difficult to say. What exactly are they used for? Obviously, I'd prefer a lower fee, but if the amount is reasonable & fair, continue.	
83	SR	a		a		a	The policy for acquiring students is at best cumbersome. In my remote area the teacher could have better served their need, at least enhanced it.	
84	SR	a		c		c		
85	SU	b	The audits shall be objective; not subjective.	c	This course represents an example of poor stewardship of MCCCD resources.	b	A minimum AZ residency shall be enforced for out-of-state people. Some use it as a temporary job and then withdrew from the arena.	

79

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DATA --- Survey of Certification Clients.

Code: First Character -- P = Provisional; L = Lifetime; S = Special
Second Character -- U = Urban; R = Rural

COUNT	CODE	Q1: Keep Certification? (a = Retain; b = Replace; c = Modify) Response	Q1 Comments	Q2: Usefulness of CC Course (a = Very Useful; b = Somewhat Useful; c = Not Useful) Response	Q2 Comments	Q3: Fees Reasonable? (a = Yes; b = Lower for in-state only; c = Lower for all) Response	Q3 Comments	GENERAL COMMENTS
86	PU	a		a	The instructor gave me and the others in the class a sense of history and purpose - a worthwhile class.	b	Due to a recent reinterpretation of community college faculty benefits, I was obliged to pay full tuition for the required course and the certification fee. This made certification rather costly.	
87	PR	a		?	Will take this fall.	a		
88	SU	b		c	I came to the orientation with more than five years of college teaching experience in another state.	c		
89	SU	c	The state certification office seems to do a good job but the test questions do not test but a candidate's ability to read and interpret rather poorly written information sheets.	c	If this refers to the information packet, then make it relevant to teaching skills, not the history of the community college system.	b		
90	LR	a		b	Establish standard syllabus and text -- statewide text used at NAU was very poor and out of date.	c	$50 lifetime would be more realistic.	
91	LR	b		b	Reduce teaching techniques aspect; shorten course overall.	b		
92	PU	a		?	Not taken yet.	b		

50

DATA --- Survey of Certification Clients.

Code: First Character -- P = Provisional; L = Lifetime; S = Special
Second Character -- U = Urban; R = Rural

COUNT	CODE	Q1: Keep Certification? a = Retain b = Replace c = Modify		Q2: Usefulness of CC Course a = Very Useful b = Somewhat Useful c = Not Useful		Q3: Fees Reasonable? a = Yes b = Lower for in-state only c = Lower for all		GENERAL COMMENTS
		Response	Comments	Response	Comments	Response	Comments	
93	LU	a		a		a	Particularly for lifetime. -- I do wish we didn't have to resubmit entirely new application materials yearly to be considered for openings.	
94	PR	b		b	A few required community college orientation lectures would be sufficient.	a		
95	LU	a		a		a		
96	SU	c		b	Info about college o.k. -- Tour, Board Mtg not as useful.	a		
97	PU	c	Hiring should be according to the needs of each individual school, not the district pool.	c		c		
98	LR	a		a	I took class at ----. Instructor was present only 2/3'ds of class time. Recommend making class 2 hours, not 3. Nor real happy with a PhD who cheats employer and students out of 1/3 of what he was paid for.	b		
99	SU	a		?		b		
100	SU	a		a		a		

82

83

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DATA --- Survey of Certification Clients.

Code: First Character -- P = Provisional; L = Lifetime; S = Special
Second Character -- U = Urban; R = Rural

COUNT	CODE	Q1: Keep Certification? a = Retain b = Replace c = Modify		Q2: Usefulness of CC Course a = Very Useful b = Somewhat Useful c = Not Useful		Q3: Fees Reasonable? a = Yes b = Lower for in-state only c = Lower for all		GENERAL COMMENTS
		Response	Comments	Response	Comments	Response	Comments	
101	LR	c	Certification can be done on the local level by the Personnel Director.	c	The course would be useful for someone planning for college administration. Some of this material can be covered on the college level at orientation programs for new teachers.	b	A fee of $25 for in-state candidates sounds reasonable.	
102	LU	a	Overall, a good & fair certification process.	a		a		
103	PR	a		?	Have not taken -- have provisional.	a		
104	SR	a		a		a		
105	LU	c	I took the course thru Rio Salado extension. That was O.K., but to sit through classes would be a complete waste of time.	b	Allow everyone the taped extension information most of it was boring, and uninformative.	b		
106	LR	c	Allow Master's Degree in teaching field to stand alone as qualifying -- certification only for those without master's.	c	Not applicable -- I had MA Ed degree & College teaching course work & experience.	c	Eliminate requirement of certification, as above, unless Master's not achieved.	
107	LR	a		a		c		
108	SR	a		c		a		
109	LU	b		c		a		
110	SU	a		?	I have not taken the class at this time.	a		

APPENDIX D

Rules for Community College Faculty Certification in Arizona

R7-1-64. Employment standards by districts; professional staffing standards; instructors; librarians; others.

R7-1-65. Certification standards

R7-1-66. Refusal of teaching certificate; appeal; review

R7-1-67. Reprimand of teacher; suspension or revocation of teaching certificate; appeal; review

R7-1-68 Certification of interns

R7-1-64. Employment standards by districts; professional staffing standards; instructors; librarians; others

A. Salaries - The district governing boards shall establish salaries for all district college personnel.

B. Personnel Leaves - District governing boards shall establish policies permitting leaves of absence, sick leaves, and vacations for all district college personnel.

C. Employment and Retention - District governing boards shall establish employment policies which protect personnel from unreasonable dismissal and the colleges from the necessity of retaining unsatisfactory personnel (A.R.S. section 15-679).

D. Professional Standards; Instructors; Librarians; Others

1. Instructors who work with academic matters or student affairs, shall be properly certificated in their major area.

2. Instructors for non-credit courses may be required to be certificated.

3. When a course is under a director or coordinator, he will be properly certificated. Specialists who teach under ten class hours in a course directed by a coordinator may be paid appropriate honorariums without their being certificated.

4. Certificated personnel must hold active certificates which are registered with the appropriate official in their district to be eligible for receiving pay.

5. Libraries shall be staffed by at least one professional librarian, possessing a graduate degree in library science, or a master's degree with a major in library science (A.R.S. section 15-660).

Historical Note - Former Rule Chapter VII. Adopted by the State Board on September 17, 1973.

R7-1-65. Certification standards

A. Five types of community college teaching certificates may be issued.

1. The three categories of regular certificates and the minimum requirements for each are as follows:

a. Regular certificate (A.1.a.)

i. A Master's degree or higher degree, earned pursuant to Subsection C. of this Section, with a minimum of twenty-four semester hours of upper division and/or graduate credit in the discipline to be taught.

ii. The Arizona Community College Course requirement in Subsection D. of this Section.

b. Regular certificate (A.1.b.) (Occupational teaching fields only)

i. A Bachelor's degree, earned pursuant to Subsection C. of this Section, with a minimum of three years of directly related occupational experience in the field to be taught.

ii. The Arizona Community College Course requirement in Subsection D. of this Section.

c. Regular certificate (A.1.c.) (Occupational teaching fields only)

i. An Associate's degree, earned pursuant to Subsection C. of this Section, or a minimum of sixty-four semester hours and, in addition, a minimum of five years of directly related occupational experience in the field to be taught.

ii. The Arizona Community College Course Requirement in Subsection D. of this Section.

2. A Special certificate (A.2.) may be issued to an individual employed to teach part-time with the following qualifications:

a. Has a Bachelor's degree or higher degree, earned pursuant to Subsection C. of this Section, or a minimum of five years of directly related occupational experience in the field to be taught, or

b. Has a regular Arizona license or a certificate in the field to be taught, and

c. Meets, or makes provision to meet, the Arizona Community College Course requirement in Subsection D. of this Section.

d. An individual who holds a Special certificate may be granted permission, under exceptional circumstances, to teach full-time, if such permission is requested under the explicit signature of the Chief Executive Officer or Chief Academic Officer of the college or college district.

3. An Honorary certificate (A.3.) may be issued as follows:

a. A community college district may employ a renowned person, who does not meet the certification requirements.

b. Such appointment shall be subject to review and approval by the State Community College Board on a year-to-year basis.

4. A Provisional certificate (A.4.) may be issued if the individual meets the requirements of the Regular certificates A.1.a., A.1.b., or A.1.c., but does not meet the Arizona Community College Course requirement in Subsection D. of this Section.

5. Pursuant to A.R.S. 15-1425(3), a District Specific certificate (A.5.) may be issued as follows:

a. A community college district may request in writing certification for a person who can not meet certification requirements in the desired teaching discipline.

b. An individual who holds a District Specific certificate shall:

i. Teach part-time only in the district originating the request for certification.

ii. Teach full-time if requested under the explicit signature of the Chief Executive Officer or Chief Academic Officer of the college or college district.

iii. Meet the Community College Course requirement in Subsection D. of this Section.

B. Community college teaching certificates may be renewed as follows:

1. Regular certificates (A.1.a., A.1.b., and A.1.c.) are permanent unless revoked.

2. Special certificates (A.2.) may be renewed at the end of two years for a six year period and may be renewed every six years thereafter.

3. Honorary certificates (A.3.) shall be renewable on an annual basis.

4. Provisional certificates (A.4.) are valid for two years and are non-renewable.

5. District Specific certificates (A.5.) may be renewed at the end of two years for a six year period and may be renewed every six years thereafter.

C. Degrees or credits shall be earned and received from an institution accredited by one of the Regional Accrediting Associations. However, degrees and credits earned from a foreign institution may be considered on an individual basis.

D. Community College Course requirement

1. The Community College Course required for the Regular certificate is a community or junior college course, offered by an Arizona university or community college district. This course shall cover content established by the State Board and shall be of such length and rigor as to warrant the awarding of three semester credit hours.

2. A person who has successfully completed a community or junior college course at an out-of-state college or university or who has taught one year full-time at a regionally accredited community college outside of Arizona, may be exempt from taking the Arizona course provided the Chief Executive Officer of the college district approves and the Certification Office of the State Board agrees the guidelines established by the State Board have been met.

3. The Community College Course requirement for the Special certificate (A.2.) and the District Specific certificate (A.5.) may be an orientation about the Arizona Community College system and its mission. The method employed shall be determined by the Chief Executive Officer of each community college district.

E. A community college district may establish qualifications in addition to those required by the State Board as long as they do not discriminate on the basis of sex, race, religion, creed or national origin, and as long as they apply equally to all faculty members in a particular discipline, vocation or program.

F. Certification fees (including evaluation and renewal) shall be established by the State Board, and the fee schedule shall be made available to any interested person.

G. Ordinances for issuing certificates shall be established by the State Board.

Historical Note - Former Rule 7-301; Amended effective April 21, 1975 (Supp. 75-1). Correction (Supp. 76-2). Amended effective August 12, 1977 (Supp. 77-4). Former Section R7-1-65 repealed, new section R7-1-65 adopted effective May 26, 1978 (Supp. 78-3); amended by the State Board on October 20, 1990, effective March 21, 1991 (Supp. 91-).

R7-1-66 Refusal of teaching certificate; appeal; review

A. The State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona may refuse a teaching certificate to a person who has:

1. A degree or degrees obtained from an institution that is not accredited by one of the Regional Accrediting Associations as listed in the Postsecondary Education Directory of Colleges and Universities published annually by the National Center for Education Statistics, or

2. Been convicted of a felony or a misdemeanor originally designated as a felony or open end offense, or

3. Provided false information on a certification application, or

4. Failed to meet the certification requirements set forth in R7-1-65, or

5. Held any certificate, license or credential, either professional or related to the field to be taught, issued by any State which was revoked or suspended, or

6. Been denied any certificate, license or credential, either professional or related to the field to be taught, by any State, or

7. Been named in a written complaint filed with the State Board regarding unprofessional conduct.

B. The procedure to appeal the refusal to grant a certificate shall be as follows:

1. A person refused a certificate may appeal by filing a written petition with supporting facts for a review with the Executive Director of the State Board. The Executive Director shall place the subject on the agenda for the next regular meeting of the State Board, and shall provide State Board members with all available pertinent information prior to the meeting.

2. After the petition has been considered by the State Board in a regular meeting as provided for above, the State Board shall at that meeting:

a. Confirm the refusal of the certificate, or

b. Refer the matter to the Executive Committee of the State Board, or

c. Refer the matter to the Certification Review Panel for further examination and recommendation.

3. The Executive Committee shall review any petition referred to it and report its recommendation to the State Board at its next regular meeting. At that meeting the State Board shall determine whether the certificate shall be granted or refused.

4. The Certification Review Panel and its chairman shall be appointed by the State Board. The Certification Review Panel shall consist of five persons as follows: one administrator and one faculty person whose initial terms shall be for three years, one local

district governing board member whose initial term shall be for one year, and two lay persons, one whose initial term shall be for one year and one whose initial term shall be for two years. Thereafter, the Certification Review Panel members shall serve three-year staggered terms.

5. The chairman of the Certification Review Panel shall fix a time, date and place for a hearing. The hearing shall be scheduled within sixty days of the date of the referral to the Certification Review Panel. Notice of the hearing shall be served upon the petitioner and may be served by registered mail, certified mail, hand delivery or a process server at least thirty days prior to the hearing date.

a. The hearing shall be held in Maricopa County, Arizona.

b. The hearing shall be informal.

c. The parties may present evidence in writing and through witnesses, and may be represented by counsel.

d. The parties shall have the right to cross-examine all witnesses.

e. If the petitioner fails to appear, the hearing may proceed.

f. The costs of transcribing the hearing shall be paid out of the certification fund of the State Board.

g. Within fifteen days after the conclusion of the hearing, the Certification Review Panel shall transmit to the State Board specific advisory findings of fact, a copy of the hearing transcript, and a recommendation whether to grant the certificate.

6. The State Board shall review the Certification Review Panel's findings of fact, recommendation, and the hearing transcript and shall decide whether to grant or refuse the certificate.

7. Within fifteen days after the State Board meeting, a report of the action of the State Board shall be sent by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, to the petitioner.

C. Any person aggrieved by a decision of the State Board has the right of appeal as provided in A.R.S. section 12-901 et seq., subject to the requirements of A.R.S. section 41-1062(B) providing an opportunity for a rehearing. Any party in a contested case before the State Board who is aggrieved by a decision rendered in such case may file with the State Board, not later than fifteen days after service of the decision, a written motion for rehearing or review of the decision specifying the particular grounds therefor. A motion to alter or amend a decision and order shall be filed not later than fifteen days after service of the decision. For purposes of this Rule a decision shall be deemed to have been served when personally delivered or mailed by certified mail to the party at his last known residence or place of business.

D. A motion for rehearing under this Rule may be amended at any time before it is ruled upon by the State Board. A response may be filed within ten days after service of such motion or amended motion by any other party or by the attorney general. The State Board may require the filing of written briefs upon the issues raised in the motion and may provide for oral argument. The State Board may consolidate the hearing to consider the motion for rehearing with the requested rehearing.

E. A rehearing or review of the decision may be granted for any of the following causes materially affecting the moving party's rights:

1. Irregularity in the administrative proceedings of the State Board or the Executive Committee or the Certification Review Panel or the prevailing party, or any order or abuse of discretion, whereby the moving party was deprived of a fair hearing;

2. Misconduct of the State Board or the prevailing party;

3. Accident or surprise which could not have been prevented by ordinary prudence;

4. Newly discovered material evidence which could not with reasonable diligence have been discovered and produced at the original hearing;

5. Excessive or insufficient penalties;

6. Error in the admission or rejection of evidence or other errors of law occurring at the administrative hearing;

7. That the decision is not justified by the evidence or is contrary to law.

F. The State Board may affirm or modify the decision or grant a rehearing to all or any of the parties and on all or part of the issues for any of the reasons set forth in Subsection E. An order granting a rehearing shall specify with particularity the ground or grounds on which the rehearing is granted, and the rehearing shall cover only those matters so specified.

G. Not later than ten days after the decision is rendered, the State Board or its Executive Committee may on its own initiative order a rehearing or review of the State Board's decision for any reason for which the State Board might have granted a rehearing on motion of a party. After giving the parties or their counsel notice and an opportunity to be heard on the matter, the State Board or its Executive Committee may grant a motion for rehearing for a reason not stated in the motion. In either case the order granting such a rehearing shall specify the grounds therefor.

H. When a motion for rehearing is based upon affidavits, they shall be served with the motion. An opposing party may within ten days after such service serve opposing affidavits, which period may be extended for an additional period not exceeding twenty days by the State Board for good cause shown or by written stipulation of the parties. Reply affidavits may be permitted.

Historical Note - Adopted effective August 25, 1978 (Supp. 78-4). Amended by the State Board on June 17, 1989. Amended effective December 13, 1989 (Supp. 89-).

R7-1-67. Reprimand of teacher; suspension or revocation of teaching certificate; appeal; review

A. The State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona may reprimand a certificated teacher or suspend or revoke the teaching certificate of a person who has:

1. Been convicted of a felony or a misdemeanor originally designated as a felony or open end offense, or

2. Provided false information on a certification application, or

3. Been named in a written complaint filed with the State Board regarding unprofessional conduct, or

4. Held any certificate, license or credential, either professional or related to the field to be taught, issued by any State which was revoked or suspended, or

5. Been denied any certificate, license or credential, either professional or related to the field to be taught by any State.

B. The procedure to reprimand a certificated teacher or suspend or revoke a certificate shall be as follows:

1. A written complaint may be filed by any person and shall be made to the Executive Director of the State Board under oath setting forth the facts supporting the request for reprimand, suspension or revocation. When a written complaint regarding unprofessional conduct is made in either R7-1-66.A.7 or R7-1-67.A.3 the National Education Association's "Code of Ethics of the Education Profession," incorporated herein by reference and on file with the Office of the Secretary of State, shall be referenced to assist in determining whether the acts complained of constitute unprofessional conduct.

2. Unless filed by the Executive Director, the Executive Director shall review the facts supporting the request for reprimand, suspension or revocation and within twenty days shall determine whether it should be referred to the State Board. If the Executive Director decides not to refer the matter to the State Board, he shall notify the complainant of that decision within thirty days after the complaint is filed. This decision may be appealed by the complainant to the State Board within thirty days after the date of mailing the decision. Otherwise, the Executive Director shall transmit the complaint to the State Board and he shall place the complaint on the State Board's agenda and shall provide all State Board members with all pertinent information prior to the meeting.

3. After the complaint has been considered by the State Board at a regular meeting, it shall at that meeting refer the matter to the Certification Review Panel for further examination and recommendation.

4. The appointment and composition of the Certification Review Panel is provided in R7-1-66.B.4.

5. The chairman of the Certification Review Panel shall have served upon the charged individual by registered mail, certified mail, hand delivery or a process server the following: a copy of the complaint, a copy of the hearing procedure as set out in this Rule, and notice that a response must be filed with the Certification Review Panel within fifteen days from receiving the notice.

6. Within five days after the receipt of the respondent's answer to the complaint, a copy shall be forwarded to the complainant.

7. An informal hearing shall be scheduled within twenty days after the respondent's answer is received by the Certification Review Panel or is due. Notice of the hearing shall be served upon the respondent and complainant by registered mail, certified mail, hand delivery or a process server at least ten days prior to the hearing date.

a. The hearing shall be held in Maricopa County, Arizona.

b. The hearing shall be informal.

c. The parties may present evidence in writing and through witnesses, and may be represented by counsel.

d. The parties shall have the right to cross-examine all witnesses.

e. If the respondent fails to appear, the hearing may proceed.

f. The costs of transcribing the hearing shall be paid out of the certification fund of the State Board.

g. Within fifteen days after the conclusion of the hearing, the Certification Review Panel shall transmit to the State Board specific advisory findings of fact, a copy of the hearing transcript, and a recommendation whether to reprimand, suspend or revoke the certificate.

8. The State Board shall review the Certification Review Panel's findings of fact, recommendation, and the hearing transcript and shall decide whether to reprimand the respondent or suspend or revoke the respondent's teaching certificate, or take no action. The State Board may take further evidence itself or remand the matter to the Certification Review Panel for the taking of additional evidence. The State Board may also hear oral argument prior to its final vote. Notice of the State Board meeting in which the decision regarding a certificate may be made shall be served upon the respondent and complainant by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, hand delivery or a process server at least five days prior to the State Board meeting.

9. If the decision of the State Board is not to reprimand the respondent or suspend or revoke the certificate, the respondent shall be notified within fifteen days after the State Board meeting by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested.

10. If the decision of the State Board is to reprimand the respondent or suspend or revoke the certificate, a written order of reprimand, suspension or revocation, together with findings of fact and conclusions of law shall be entered in the minutes of the State Board's meeting and a copy shall be sent to the respondent within fifteen days after the State Board meeting by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested. A report of the action of the State Board shall be sent to the complainant, to the Chief Administrative Officer of each community college district in Arizona and to the Arizona Department of Education within fifteen days after the State Board's decision.

C. Any person aggrieved by a decision of the State Board has the right of appeal as provided in A.R.S. section 12-901 et seq., subject to the requirements of A.R.S. section 41-1062(B) providing an opportunity for a rehearing. Any party in a contested case before the State Board who is aggrieved by a decision rendered in such case may file with the State Board, not later than fifteen days after service of the decision, a written motion for rehearing or review of the decision specifying the particular grounds therefor. A motion to alter or amend a decision and order shall be filed not later than fifteen days after service of the decision. For purposes of this Rule a decision shall be deemed to have been served when personally delivered or mailed by registered or certified mail to the party at his last known residence or place of business.

D. A motion for rehearing under this Rule may be amended at any time before it is ruled upon by the State Board. A response may be filed within ten days after service of such motion or amended motion by any other party or by the attorney general. The State Board may require the filing of written briefs upon the issues raised in the motion and may provide for oral argument. The State Board may consolidate the hearing to consider the motion for rehearing with the requested rehearing.

E. A rehearing or review of the decision may be granted for any of the following causes materially affecting the moving party's rights:

1. Irregularity in the administrative proceedings of the State Board or the Certification Review Panel or the prevailing party, or any order or abuse of discretion, whereby the moving party was deprived of a fair hearing;

2. Misconduct of the State Board or the prevailing party;

3. Accident or surprise which could not have been prevented by ordinary prudence;

4. Newly discovered material evidence which could not with reasonable diligence have been discovered and produced at the original hearing;

5. Excessive or insufficient penalties;

6. Error in the admission or rejection of evidence or other errors of law occurring at the administrative hearing;

7. That the decision is not justified by the evidence or is contrary to law.

F. The State Board may affirm or modify the decision or grant a rehearing to all or any of the parties and on all or part of the issues for any of the reasons set forth in Subsection E. An order granting a rehearing shall specify with particularity the ground or grounds on which the rehearing is granted, and the rehearing shall cover only those matters so specified.

G Not later than ten days after a decision is rendered, the State Board or its Executive Committee may on its own initiative order a rehearing or review of the State Board's decision for any reason for which it might have granted a rehearing on motion of a party. After giving the parties or their counsel notice and an opportunity to be heard on the matter, the State Board or its Executive Committee may grant a motion for rehearing for a reason not stated in the motion. In either case the order granting such a rehearing shall specify the grounds therefor.

H. When a motion for rehearing is based upon affidavits, they shall be served with the motion. An opposing party may within ten days after such service serve opposing affidavits, which period may be extended for an additional period not exceeding twenty days by the State Board for good cause shown or by written stipulation of the parties. Reply affidavits may be permitted.

Historical Note - Adopted effective August 25, 1978 (Supp. 78-4). Amended by the State Board on June 17, 1989. Amended effective December 13, 1989 (Supp. 89-).

R7-1-68. Certification of interns

A. The State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona may issue a teaching certificate to college interns to teach if the applicant meets the folowing qualifications:

1. The applicant holds or is a candidate for the Masters degree in an academic field or holds or is a candidate for a Bachelors degree in an occupational field from a fully accredited university.

2. The applicant has been recommended for and admitted to an intern program recognized by the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona.

3. The applicant meets the qualifications for certification as contained in R7-1-65.D.1.

B. Intern teaching certificates shall be issued for a period of one semester or six (6) months and may not be renewed.

Historical Note - Adopted effective February 28, 1980 (Supp. 80-1). Adopted by the State Board on November 17, 1979.